

In the name of Creator

THE UNIVERSAL PROPHET

Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants: the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar. For this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. -Galatians 4:21-31

The above passage is taken from the letter by Paul to Galatians. This passage, however, finds no place and no relevance to the letter when it is observed keeping in view of the theme and

the purpose and intention with which it had been written. And at the same time it rather contradicts the very purpose of the letter which it had mainly been intended for.

However, as according to the present matter at issue, we are not concerned about the letter on the whole and the contradictions therein. But what primarily needed is- the above passage: for it provides some fundamental facts about the universal prophet Mohammad.

So, now let us discuss these points one after another basing on the passage and the other relevant scriptural facts.

The above passage is consisting of two kinds of verses, those are ...

1. Decisive in meaning which give clear meaning enabling even a lay man to understand without least trouble, and
2. Allegoric which also convey the clear meaning of it; yet some literary and grammatical knowledge is required to know its perspective meaning.

Synopsis of the passage

From the above passage it is evident that Abraham had two sons one was born by a bondwoman and the other by a freewoman respectively. The first was born after the flesh means by means of natural phenomenon by human intercourse resulting in conception. The second by spirit means by special favour of God by spiritual means (miraculously- Galatians 4:29). These two women are two covenants out of whom two great progenies of two great nations followed, each through each of them respectively. So far it is well and good. But what surprising is, the fact that the further verses rather seem to be of derogatory in nature against one progeny particularly so that the superiority might be well imputed to the former one. Their superiority complexion and the claim of alleged legal inheritance of both spiritual and material over the former one went so far as to declare...

Nevertheless what saith the scripture? cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. -Galatians 4:30

And further attempts were made to provoke anger and create unending disharmony and hatred against each other by the false accusation such as...

But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. -Galatians 4:29

And again the spiritual inheritance was tried to be forcibly captured by creating wrong interpretation and misconception of the verse...

For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. -Galatians 4:27

Now we have to know about the following persons and points so as to know the facts what they had really been originally and how they have been perverted subsequently.

1. Abraham 2. Bondwoman 3. Freewoman 4. Two sons of Abraham (a) Ishamil by Hager (b) Isaac by Sarah. 5. Two covenants: one from each woman respectively, and 6. Keyverses of the passage as here under mentioned to be discussed...

a. But he who was by the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. -Galatians 4:23

b. Which things are an allegory for these are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage which is Hagar. -Galatians 4:24

c. For this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free which is the mother of us all. -Galatians 4:25-26

d. For it is wirtten, Rejoice thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. -Galatians 4:27

e. Now, we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. -Galatians 4:28-31

1. Abraham :

a) He was so named because he was to become the father of many nations.

Thus God says:

Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee -Genesis 17:5

b. He was a prophat of God. "... for he is a prophet". -Genesis 20:7

c. He was so obedient to God, and righteous in his deeds that God called him a friend of Himself.

And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the friend of God -James 2:23

d. He passed through the trials of God all successful and hence he was promised.

Migration of Abraham

This was the first trial of God with Abraham. God commanded him to leave his father's house and his native place (country).

Thus we read:

Now the Lord had said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee. -Genesis 12:1

Abraham obeyed God

*So abraham departed, as the Lord had spoken unto him...
-Genesis 12:4*

The Exile: of son and wife

The exile of his only beloved son and beloved wife. This was the second trial of God with Abraham.

*And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad and because of thy bond woman...
-Genesis 21:12*

NB: Manipulations of the church can be disclosed as we go through the arguments.

Ordred by God: but not by Sarah-disclosed

The exile of his only beloved son Ishmael and his beloved wife Hagar was commanded by God. It is, anyway, conceivable how horrible the matter was it to send out the only child who was given in his old age and the mother who gave birth to it. Is it possible for any man to cast out of his sight, to those that became the delight of his sight? But the friend of God, the most obedient, being a prophet, Abraham exiled his wife Hagar along with his only child who was hardly a year old to the wilderness of Beer-sheba, the place uninhabited where even water was not available.

While ordering the exile, God said to Abraham *"Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad and because of thy bond-woman"* (Genesis 21:12). This shows that how great love and affection that Abraham had for them. But one should not misunderstand that he became grievous and hesitant in obeying God just taking into consideration of the words...

Let it not be grievous in thy sight.

Though the man is ready to carry out the command, this type of words are generally used with an intent to make the man more firm in obedience and determination in carrying out the requisite command. We have a similar usage in Genesis 46:3, when Jacob was ready and determined to go to Egypt to meet his lost son Joseph, God said with him, *"Fear not to go to Egypt"* Then does it mean that Jacob was afraid to go to Egypt? No. But he was so anxious and curious to go there to see his lost son after so many years. Thus was the case with Abraham too.

Abraham spontaneously made arrangements for the exile and sent them out.

Thus we read in Genesis...

And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water and gave it unto Hagar putting it on her shoulder and the child and sent her away: and she departed and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-Sheba -21:14

And the water was spent in the bottle and she cast the child under one of the shrubs -21:15

And she went, and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bow's shot: for she said, Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lift up her voice and wept. -21:16

And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her what aileth thee Hagar? Fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is -21:17

Arise, lift up the lad and hold him in thine hand; for I will make him a great nation. -21:18

*And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water: and she went and filled the bottle with water and gave the lad drink.
-21:19*

And God was with the lad; and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer. -21:20

The above verses prove that Abraham had spontaneously obeyed God's command and exiled Hagar along with his only child. Thus he came out all successful from God's second trial also.

Ishmael was infant below a year at his exile but not 16 years old as church manipulated

Now let us have a glance over the manipulations of the Church.

A close examination of the verses reveals the fact that this second trial of banishment took place while Ishmael was just below one year old child.

But what makes one think seriously is the point that why church has presented this event to have been taken place after the birth of the second son Isaac to Abraham by Sarah.

Thus we read as has been recorded as preamble for the banishment (Genesis 21:8-13).

And the child [Isaac] grew, and was weaned: and Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned. -21:8

And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian [Ishmael], which she had born unto Abraham, mocking (21:9) wherefore she said unto Abraham, cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. -21:10

And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son -21:11

And God said unto Abraham, let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bond woman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice: for in Isaac shall thy seed be called -21:12

And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed -21:13

The above passage (Genesis 21:8-13) is the preamble of the banishment of Hagar which we made mention earlier to this under reference Genesis 21:14-20

In this passage the perversion of the facts according to their fancy and that how church had tampered the text of the Bible can be seen. The reason for such heinous task is nothing but as we told earlier, that the Church had been in constant pertinacity to derogate the progeny of Ishmael and to exalt the supremacy of Israelites over Ishmaelites through whom the universal prophet was promised. And thus to attribute this promise of God made to Abraham, to the person of Jesus, the descendant from the progeny of Isaac (the Israelites).

Before going into details, let us first know the age difference between Ishmael the first son and Isaac the second son of Abraham. This will help a lot to make easy our further arguments.

A. Abraham was 86 years old when Hagar bare Ishmael to Abraham (Genesis 16:16).

B. And Abraham was 100 years old, when Isaac was born to him (Genesis 21:5).

Thus at the time when Isaac was born (100-86) Ishmael was 14 years old.

So the age difference between Ishmael and Isaac was 14 years. Ishmael was elder and Isaac was younger.

The preamble of the event as recorded in the Bible is closely examined as here under so that the facts that how the Church ma-

nipulated can be brought into limelight.

A. And the child (Isaac) grew and was weaned. And Abraham made a great feast the same day that Isaac was weaned (Genesis 21:8).

Notes: On examination of the Biblical records we have derived that the age difference between Ishmael and Isaac was 14 years.

Naturally the weaning of milk for a child takes at least 2 years. Thus by the time when Isaac was weaned, the age of Ishmael was 16 years.

B. And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking (Genesis 21:9). In this verse it is stated that Ishmael 16 years old boy mocked at Isaac the two years old child. In the family where there was only one boy till fourteen long years, and then if the second child happened to be his companion and family member, what great pleasant the homely environment to the first boy is beyond expression. This is but natural phenomenon in the attitude of the children in particular. If that be the case can any body believe that Ishmael had mocked at Isaac? That too at the age of sixteen years?

Let us for some time agree that Ishmael had mocked. But we would like to question the Church, that whether it would make any difference for the boy of two years either he be mocked at or appeased by? Of course makes no difference and if at all there was some reaction in Isaac, as is found in the cases of most sensitive boys in very rare and exceptional cases, that mockery even, can be taken as a play of the boy, but not a matter so seriously be taken into account to. But it troubled and teased the Church very much and termed that mockery, after all a silly thing, as persecution and declared as hereunder to create disharmony as we earlier said.

But as then he that was born after flesh [Ishmael] persecuted

*him that was born after spirit [Isaac] even so now it is.
-Galatians 4:29*

NB: Why and when the Church developed this type of hatred against Ishmael and his progeny can be noticed while going through our arguments.

The child Isaac who was mocked at was calm. But the Church is troubled. What a great sin had Ishmael committed! Mocked!? Unpardonable sin, which made them to pass a decree against Ishmael that he should be banished and his mother too, though she was innocent, merely because she gave birth to him (perhaps).

Wherefore she [Sarah] said unto Abraham, cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bond woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. -21:10

And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son -Genesis 21:11

This verse (Genesis 21:11) may be the one which might have been stated in some other context. Abraham's grievance for his son might be of some other reason which is nowhere recorded in the Bible, yet can be predicted that some domestic affairs between the fellow- wives that generally (take place) happen (in polygamy) might have brought up such a situation (God knows). In the verse (Genesis 21:10) Sarah says that Ishmael was the son of a bondmaid as if that he had no sonship with Abraham and deprived Ishmael of his spiritual as well as material inheritance of Abraham's legacy by commanding the banishment of Hagar along with Ishmael. But in the verse (Genesis 21:11) it is stated that anything against Ishmael was very grievous in the sight of Abraham and thus the inheritance was also protected. Contradiction, of course between these two verses is obvious on account of displacement of the verse under Ref: Genesis 21:11

C. And God said unto Abraham let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice: for in Isaac shall thy seed be called -Genesis 21:12

And also the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed. -Genesis 21:13

In the verse 21:12 it is stated that Abraham's seed shall be called (only) in Isaac. This is the key point which Church was particular to bring about, to deprive the Ishmaelites of the legal inheritance of the legacy of Abraham. For this reason only this preamble of the banishment has been created which facts can be disclosed by the event itself as recorded in the Bible.

Further in the verse 21:13 Abraham was promised that God would make Ishmael also a nation because he was his seed. Thus the attempts of the Church which they made to snatch away the legal inheritance of Ishmael and his progeny, are made null and void by declaring that Ishmael was also a son of Abraham and thus Ishmael and his seed continue to inherit the father Abraham's legacy both spiritual and material whatever. Examine the two clauses of the two verses.

1. For in Isaac shall thy seed be called -21:12

2. Ishmael is thy seed -21:13

Example:

1. You shall be called good.

(No guarantee is there whether there be any goodness in him; but he shall be called good).

2. You are good.

(Goodness is affirmed. No matter whether one calls him good or bad).

Keeping in view of this example the above clauses of the two verses as cited above may be examined so as to know in whom the prominence of being his seed is applicable to whether in Isaac or in Ishmael.

As a matter of fact, at the time of exile, Ishmael was only an infant of below one year. Therefore Isaac was not yet born. If this be the case where is the chance to declare as...

For in Isaac shall thy seed be called?

Is this only point not enough to prove that how the Church has manipulated the things according to their whims and fancies? This event of banishment starts from Genesis 21:8-20. This passage can be divided under two parts one from Genesis 21:8-13 as preamble of the event, and the second from Genesis 21:14-20 as the actual event of banishment. These two parts contradict with each other. Let us examine.

According to the preamble of the banishment event it is learnt that Hagar and Ishmael were sent out of their house on the accusation that Ishmael mocked at Isaac on the feast of his (Isaac's) weaning. This goes to prove beyond doubt, that by that time, Ishmael was about sixteen years old.

But according to the narrations as regards to the event of banishment, all the verses very convincingly prove that Ishmael was an infant below a year. Please observe the following points as narrated in the event.

*... and took bread and a bottle of water and gave it unto Hagar putting it on her shoulder and the child and sent her away.
-Genesis 21:14*

In the above verse it is evident that bread and bottle of water and the child were put on the shoulder of Hagar. Were the child sixteen years old, could the mother have carried him on her shoulder all the way to Beer-sheba? Could he not have accompanied with his mother by walking along with her?

And further if he were sixteen years old as recorded in the preamble, he could have accompanied his mother in the walk and hence, as both were being sent, the clauses should have originally been to read as "sent them away" and 'they departed and wandered' but not as 'sent her away' and she departed and wandered'. Here the clause 'sent her away' means to say clearly that the child was on her shoulder, and she was being sent out. So the clause is a literal proof that at the time of banishment, Ishmael was an infant of below one year. And further verses make this point clear.

...and she cast the child under one of the shrubs -Genesis 21:15

She cast the child... wherefrom? From her shoulder. Whereon? on the ground under the shrub. This clearly speaks of the fact that she brought her child keeping it on her shoulder right from the house to the place of Beer-sheba, where at last cast the child under one of the shrubs. Was he really a boy of sixteen years old?

...Let me not see the death of the child -Genesis 21:16

Thus Hagar thinks within herself and sat herself aloof weeping.

Were he really sixteen years old, could he not have come to his mother and consoled her?

Were he the cause (as he was accused to have mocked at Isaac) for her banishment, could he not have repented himself and asked his mother for his forgiveness? Was he a physically handicapped one or dumb who despite his age, could not move from the

place where he was cast down? and speak with his mother? or was he a notorious mischief monger who was amusingly watching the play (episode) his mother was enacting as a result of his own mischief? May God forbid. He was an infant helplessly crying for milk and the poor mother helplessly sat aloof from the child not bearing her son to be famished. Then God showered His mercy on both the child and the mother...

Spring of water gushed forth miraculously-

And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven and said unto her what aileth thee, Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise lift up the lad and hold him in thine hand: for I will make him a great nation. -Genesis 21:17-18

And again when God miraculously created a spring of water Hagar hastened herself and filled the bottle with water and gave the lad drink -Genesis 21:19

This goes to prove that Ishmael was yet an infant.

All these points are self evident to prove that the banishment of Hagar along with her child took place while Ishmael the child was yet an infant below a year of age; but not sixteen years old boy as has been made apparent from the narrations as recorded in their preamble for this event. Then therefore there arises no question of the existence of Isaac at all, who as a matter of fact was born after fourteen years after the birth of Ishmael. As such the command of Sarah for Hagar's banishment is also proved to be baseless. Then therefore the verse "*Wherefore she [Sarah] said unto Abraham, cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son even with Isaac*" (Genesis 21:10) is proved to be an interpolation and after thought development of the church which has been inserted after the seed

of Ishmael the followers of Mohammad came out all successful and dominant over spiritual as well as material inheritance of Abraham as had been promised to him which we will discuss in detail in our further arguments.

If the banishment was not commanded by Sarah, there come some logical questions as regards to it.

1. Why was the banishment imposed?
2. And by whom was it decreed?

Let us for a while agree that Sarah had demanded the banishment of Hagar in envious retaliation against her fellow- wife on any other reason rather than what has already been discussed. Were it so she could have expelled Hagar and her child Ishmael from their house and Hagar could have taken shelter in some neighbouring house of the same place or at the most in some adjacent village. But the thing is not so. She was sent to Beer-sheba a remote wilderness uninhabited and where even water was not available.

As a matter of fact as we said in the beginning that God wanted to try Abraham and see whether his love and obedience for Him surpass the love and affection that he had on his beloved son Ishmael who was given to him in his old age. And Abraham (might have) revealed this decree of God before Hagar. And she being an obedient handmaid of God, whole heartedly accepted to co-operate with Abraham in this trial of God. This was the reason that why though she was sent to Beer-sheba where no human being was there nor anything to eat nor even to drink, could not leave that place until she received help from God Himself...

Beer-sheba was, most presumably the place which had been pointed out by God, just as the place of sacrifice of Abraham's only son was pointed out (Genesis 22:2).

Otherwise she could have gone some where else where she could have been provided shelter and food by any on humanitarian grounds. Of course this (the truth pertaining to trial) is nowhere recorded in the Bible in clear terms for the obvious reasons that the Church which has been in persistent trials to derogate ishmael and his posterity could never leave any matter intact recorded in favour of them except those which they might have not understood to have been stated in their (Ishmaelites) favour or with a blind hope that they could twist them in their (Israelite's) favour.

However just in obedience to the God's command Abraham sent Hagar to Beer-sheba with some bread and a bottle of water along with his child Ishmael (Genesis 21:14). What little bread and water was given to her was consumed (Genesis 21:15). She was starving and thirsty. In this way perhaps a day or two might have been spent. She wandered in the wilderness in search of water all the time as long as she could. As it was a wilderness uninhabited she could not get herself separated from the child. She could not keep the child at any place for fear of animal attack or any other fateful calamity. What all efforts she made in search of water to quench off her thirst, all the time she was carrying the child on her shoulder.

Starvation and thirst on one hand and on the other the suckling of the child and running here and there in search of water made her so weak which might have resulted in absorption of milk in her breasts. Then the child began to cry for milk. The more she tried to console the child by giving the false suck with empty breasts the more the child was crying for milk.

She could tolerate every thing for her. But she was not able to bear the cry of the child which was as if it were piercing her ears and pricking in the heart. So...

... She cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him a good way off as it were a bow shot: for she said Let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him and lift up her voice and wept.

-Genesis 21:15-16

Then

And God heard the voice of the lad: And the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven and said unto her what aileth thee Hagar? fear not: for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise lift up the lad and hold him in thine hand; for I will make him a great nation. -Genesis 21:17-18

God did not keep quiet with mere promise to make the child a great nation but showered His mercy on both the mother and child by creating miraculously a spring of water there : which is according to Islamic version called water of Zam-Zam, which has been gushing forth eversince, just near the Holy Kaba in Mecca.

And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water; and she went and filled the bottle with water and gave the lad drink -Genesis 21:19

And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water -21:19

What a humourous clauses are these! It impress to mean that a well was already existing there. But all the time Hagar was blind and was not able to see it. What is it that Church is going to loose if it clearly mention that God had miraculously created a spring of water there? Is it a greater thing to veil over than the appearance of the angel of God and giving her the glad tidings about Ishmael saying that God would make him a great nation? (Genesis 21:17-18)

However what all these points which are discussed so far lead to think, that it does not behove to the majesty of the Church to give a clear picture of the things and to make mention of the favours

conferred upon Hagar and Ishmael. As a matter of fact the eyes of Hagar were not opened to see the well of water but a spring of water was miraculously provided for them, just like a ram was found in the thicket by Abraham to sacrifice in his son's stead. There was no ram already available there. But when Abraham was about to sacrifice his only son, God miraculously provided the ram to substitute his son's sacrifice (Genesis 22:13).

Not only God had provided water for them but also sustenance for their subsistence. Though it is not recorded in the Bible the following verse confirms it.

And God was with the lad and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer -Genesis 21:20

Sacrifice of the only son

This is the third trial of God with Abraham.

And it came to pass after these things that God did tempt Abraham and said unto him, Abraham and he said, Behold here I am. And he said, take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of. And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and saddled his ass, and took two of his young men with him, and Isaac his son, and clave the wood for the burnt offering, and rose up, and went unto the place of which God had told him. Then on the third day Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off. And Abraham said unto his young men, Abide ye here with the ass; and I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you. And Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering and laid it upon Isaac his son: and he took the fire in his hand, and a knife; and they went both of them together. And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said my father: and he said, Here am I, my son. And he said, Behold the fire and the wood: but where is lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said, my son, God will provide for himself a lamb for a burnt offering! so they went both of

them together. And they came to the place which God had told him of, and Abraham built an altar there, and laid the wood in order, and bound Isaac his son, and laid him on the alter upon the wood. And Abraham stretched forth his hand and took the knife to slay his son. And the angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven and said, Abraham, Abraham; and he said, Here am I. And he said, lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me. And Abraham lifted up his eyes, and looked, and behold, behind him a ram caught in a thicket by his horns: and Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son. And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah- Jireh: as it is said to this day. In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen. And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore. and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. So Abraham returned unto his young men, and they rose up and went together to Beer-sheba; and Abraham dwelt at Beer-sheba.

-Genesis 22:1-19

The only son of Abraham was Ishmael: but not Isaac-

According to the above passage we came to know that God ordained Abraham to offer his only son in sacrifice. The only son means that there is no other son beside him, a well known fact even to a lay man which point however, needs no explanation. This goes to prove beyond doubt that the sacrifice was ordained even before the birth of Isaac the second son to Abraham. So the only son invariably refers to the first son Ishmael. But what perturbs one to find is that it is mentioned in the Bible saying as "*Thine only son Isaac*". It is not a contradiction which generally takes place as a result of two different statements for any particular issue, but a glaring interpola-

tion wilfully committed. The only son refers to Ishmael but not to Isaac.

The second reason is-

it is said as '*thine only son*'. Only son refers to the elder son even before the birth of the second son or successive children. Were there two sons at that time the use of the word 'only son' remains humorous and meaningless. So it proves beyond doubt that this trial of sacrifice took place while Ishmael being the only son even before the birth of Isaac.

As regards to this we have a good reference in the passage itself. When Abraham was about to sacrifice his son with the knife, the angel of God called him and said-

And he [the angel of God] said, lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son thine only son from me. -Genesis 22:11-12

The above underlined part of the verse goes to explain that God saying through his angel as... "I tried you asking to exile your only son along with your wife Hagar, to see whether you would obey me in that respect or that you would keep yourself behind out of love and affection for your only son. Though it was a matter unacceptable easily for a man to get himself away from the only child who was given to him in his old age, from which trial you have gone through successful yet it was not as horrible and impracticable as the sacrifice of your only child. Now you have on my command, did not care even your only beloved son. The sacrifice of your only son is a token which has marked an end whithin itself of any trial. No trial whatever, can be greater than the spontaneous sacrifice of the only son by a father. So as you have come out of this trial too successfully, you have proved yourself as a God fearing man whose love

and obedience for his Lord surpassed over the love and affection on any body else in the world".

Now we would like to invite the attention of the readers to ascertain keeping in view of these facts whether both the trials (Banishment & Sacrifice) were made with the same person the only son Ishmael or one with Ishmael and the other with Isaac as Church contends.

Thine only son - Isaac?

Take note of the clause '*Thine only son Isaac*' from the verse Genesis 22:2

Bear in mind that this was commanded by God to Abraham who had two sons, the elder son Ishmael and the younger one Isaac.

Had the verse been to read as 'thine only son Ishmael' there would have been no problem to understand that this commandment was made even before the birth of the younger son Isaac. But it is clearly mentioned as ... '*thine only son Isaac*' which gives rise to suspect-

1. ... whether God was sane or insane by that time who did not possess so much of literary Knowledge (May God forbid) as even an elementary student who can unhesitatingly declare that a great blunder had been committed in the literary aspect.
2. ... that Ishmael might have been dead by that time so that the term of the 'only son' could be applicable to Isaac. Was Ishmael really dead by that time? No. After the death of Abraham both the sons were present to bury their father.

Thus we read:

And his [Abraham's] sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him [Abraham] in the cave of Mechpelah... -Genesis 25:9

Could a dead son have ever buried his dead father?

3. ... that God might have disqualified the sonship of Ishmael and deleted his name from the rolls of sonship to Abraham.

But contrary to this, that to whatever extent the church may try to prove that Ishmael is not the son of Abraham spiritually or whatever, that God himself confirms the sonship of Ishmael with a promise...

Thus we read:

(God said to Abraham)

And also of the son of bondwoman [Ishmael] will I make a nation, because he is thy seed -Genesis 21:13

Now the question is not whether he was a son of a bondwoman or a freewoman, but what we primarily need is, whether he was a son of Abraham or not. It is proved beyond doubt that he was a son. Then therefore the command for the sacrifice of his only son most reasonably applicable to Ishmael being the elder son. And it can also be inferred that by that time Isaac was not yet born. Had Isaac already born by that time God would not have said... '*Thine only son Isaac*' but rather would have said in clear terms as... '*thine son Isaac*' if God were particular with Isaac's sacrifice. Now we leave this matter here for the discretion of the readers to ascertain keeping in view of these facts discussed to whom the term 'only son' reasonably applicable to... whether to Ishmael or Isaac.

Ishmael was given in sacrifice before the birth of Isaac

Further Bible provides a very useful information to prove that

the trial of sacrifice took place while Ishmael was the only son and that even before the birth of Isaac, the second one. Here we must bear in mind that the age difference between Ishmael and Isaac was fourteen years. That means when Ishmael attained his fourteen years age, then Isaac was born. Therefore 'the only son' who was taken for sacrifice must not be above the age of thirteen years, by that time. please note the following points in conformity with the above matter.

1. The bundle of wood necessary for the burnt offering was laid upon the son who was being taken for sacrifice (Genesis 22:6).

This proves beyond doubt that the son was not below the age of ten years. Were it not so, the bundle of wood could not have been possibly carried by him.

2. And again the boy enquired ignorantly...

Where is the lamb for burnt offering? -Genesis 22:7

Ignorantly asking for the lamb necessary for the sacrifice and carrying the bundle of wood necessary for the same, is possible only with a boy aged between 10-12 years. If he were above this age he could have smelt that he himself was the scapegoat, and would not have ignorantly asked about the lamb necessary for the sacrifice. And if he were below this age carrying of the bundle of wood could not have been possible for him.

3. And again if the boy were above this age it could not have been possible for the old father to bind the son and to lay him upon the altar of wood. -Genesis 22:9
4. And if he were below this age not knowing the weight of the commandment of God, would have created a lot of hue and cry; though not could escape.

5. What the fact is, when asked about the lamb, the father might have disclosed the fact that he himself was the lamb to whom he was going to sacrifice, and the son might have readily accepted to be sacrificed for God just like his mother Hagar readily accepted to be banished in obedience to the God's command and extended her full co-operation to Abraham in carrying out the trial of banishment successfully. And this was the reason how the old father could manage to carry out the ordained sacrifice in a very calm manner.

The above points most authentically prove that the boy who was taken for the burnt offering, was most presumably roughly about the age of twelve or thirteen years. These points however basing on the age factor keeping in view of the term 'The only son' most reasonably applicable to Ishmael only as until after he attained his age of fourteen years, Isaac the second son of Abraham did not exist at all.

The Church may try to defend the above points by saying that these points discussed under age factor can also be applicable to Isaac. We too agree for this. But this argument can be dampened by the term 'The only son'.

Sacrifice (Thine only son) whom thou lovest

The third important point that lead us to declare that it was Ishmael that was taken for sacrifice but not Isaac is as follows:

Further take note of the clause, '*whom thou lovest*' (him thou offer in sacrifice) of the verse Genesis 22:2. When it is made clear that the sacrifice was commanded to Abraham, his only son, even before the birth of Isaac, it is meaningless again to probe into the matter whether he loved Ishmael or Isaac; because by that time Isaac did not exist at all. Yet let us examine that how great love and affection that Abraham had on Ishmael so that the matter can be well decided.

- a. Our readers are well aware that Abraham remained childless upto his 75 years age.
- b. When the word of God came to him in vision, he expressed his fond hope for a child as his heir and desperately enquires God that what was He going to give him when he was going childless. (Genesis 15:2)
- c. Then God promised him of a son showing the stars and assuring him saying '*so shall thy seed be.*' (Genesis 15:5)
- d. Abraham believed the promise of God and was curiously expecting for a child further ten years more. Thus ever since he married he had been expecting for a child upto his eighty five (85) years age.
- e. Now Sarah the wife of Abraham too lost all her hopes and gave Hagar to be his wife (Genesis 16:3). We have discussed this point in our coming pages in detail.
- f. 'And Hagar bare Abraham a son: and Abraham called his son's name which Hagar bare Ishmael to Abraham. (Genesis 16:15)
- g. Thus he obtained a child for himself in his eighty six (86) years age. (Genesis 16:16)

In a situation such as this, it is needless to write that however great poet or writer one may be cannot do justice to describe the affection and love that Abraham had on Ishmael.

- h. In this way Abraham spent fourteen(14) long years with Ishmael.
- i. We have another proof which show that the love and affection that Abraham had on Ishmael was greater than any thing else. This is why when Abraham was being promised of a second son Isaac,

Abraham showed his contentment only with Ishmael and unmindfulness to have another child for him.

Thus we read:

And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee! -Genesis 17:18

- j. And again that what ever light thing that was against to Ishmael, was very grievous in the sight of Abraham. Thus we read:

And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son [Ishmael] -Genesis 21:11

- k. And what most note worthy is that even before and after the birth of Isaac, Abraham lived with Hagar and Ishmael at Beer-sheba.

Thus we read:

So Abraham returned unto his young men and they rose up and went together to Beer-sheba; and Abraham dwelt at Beer-sheba. -Genesis 22:19

Above is the verse relating to the period even before the birth of Isaac. Yet what we want to point out from it is that Abraham was living with Hagar and Ishmael at Beer-sheba. It does not mean that he never turned upto Kirjathebra, where Sarah was living. Now and then he might be coming; but most of his time was spent with Ishmael and Hagar at Beer-sheba. This point further can be proved from the following points.

our above proclamation in point (k) that Abraham lived with Hagar and Ishmael, at Beer-sheba, even before and after the birth of the second son Isaac, rather seems to be ambiguous for our christian brethren; as it is recorded in the Bible that until after two years of the birth of Isaac they all lived together as one family. Therefore it can-

not be contradictory if it is admitted that Abraham lived with (Ishmael the first son and Hagar the second wife) to a limited duration of fourteen years before Isaac's birth and only two years after. But his living at Beer-sheba with them is a matter inconceivable, because as according to Church, Beer-sheba is the place where Hager and Ishmael were migrated to, by Abraham on the command of Sarah, the first wife as an everlasting and irrevokable punishment for them. If this be the case where was chance for Abraham to reunite again with them at Beer-sheba? Thus they logically pose.

Before going into argument the foremost important point that one should know is that whether Ishmael was exiled to Beer-sheba while he was an infant as we say or sixteen years old boy as Church makes it apparent in its interpolated preamble of the story of Banishment. However this point has been discussed and proved in our previous pages 7-18 which may once again be recollected. To make sure that Ishmael was exiled in his infancy, please go through Genesis 21:14-19

So it may be noted that Ishmael was exiled while he was an infant below a year. Thus Abraham again became childless. The age difference between Ishmael and Isaac was fourteen years. Thus, if the contention of the Church were true, Abraham remained further thirteen years without the company of his child after his exile. If this be the case, when God was again promising him of a second son, Isaac, could ever Abraham have showed his contentment only with the first son Ishmael saying as- '*O that Ishmael might live before thee!*'? Do the words spoken at the time of the promise of a second son, saying as '*Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!*' not prove with authenticity that he was sharing and enjoying the company of the first son Ishmael at Beer-sheba?

And again does God's promise of a second son by Sarah the first wife at Mamre, not prove that he was coming now and then to

the first wife also? Then do these points not prove that Abraham lived with Ishmael and Hagar even before and after the birth of Isaac as we told?

And again, even at the time of Sarah's death he was not with Isaac and Sarah but was with Ishmael and Hagar at Beer-sheba.

Please examine the following:

And Sarah died in Kirjathebra; the same is Hebron in the land of canan, and Abraham came to mourn for Sarah and to weep for her. -Genesis 23:2

In view of these points, we can easily imagine that whom did Abraham love and to whom the words '*Thou lovest*' applicable to. In clear terms as Abraham loved Ishmael, keeping in view of the term '*whom thou lovest*', (him thou give in sacrifice), it can be well established that it was Ishmael who was given in sacrifice.

Sacrifice of the only son substituted by a ram : only son was saved: Abraham returned to Beer-sheba with his son and dwelt there:

And the fourth important point which lead us to conclude that it was Ishmael that had been taken to offer in sacrifice- but not Isaac, is as follows:

Kudos to Abraham! The most obedient servant of God who did not care his beloved only son to offer him in the sacrifice. Did God really want the blood and the flesh of his son? No. But He wanted to see the faith and spontaneous sacrifice of Abraham. When Abraham was about to slay, God well pleased with his sacrifice and said-

... lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou anything unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.

-Genesis 22:12

Thus when God prevented Abraham to sacrifice his only son and when the commandment for the sacrifice was withdrawn by God Himself, Abraham took the boy and his young men and returned to Beer-sheba where he dwelt.

Thus we read:

So Abraham returned to his young men, and they rose up and went together to Beer-sheba; and Abraham dwelt at Beer-sheba. -Genesis 22:19

Our discerning readers will remember that Beer-sheba was the place where Hagar and Ishmael were migrated to, and were living there. Abraham's return to Beer-sheba goes to prove beyond doubt that he brought the son from there and returned there again.

If it were not Ishmael, why did he return to Beer-sheba?

And if it were Isaac, he should have gone to Kirjathseba in the land of Canaan where Sarah was living, instead of Beer-sheba.

Church manipulated: imputed sacrifice to Isaac: So as to attribute promise of universal prophet to Jesus

All these points prove that Church had manipulated and made interpolations in the text to mean as Isaac was the son demanded for the sacrifice with an intent to attribute the blessings and promises made to the son taken for sacrifice to ascribe to Isaac from whose posterity Jesus descended so as to ascribe all these to Jesus himself finally.¹

1a. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ (Galatians 3:16)

b. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. (Galatians 3:29)

The universal prophet was promised

Now let us examine the promises made to Abraham.

A. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great: and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee; and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

-Genesis 12:2-3

B. ...lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever. -Genesis 13:14-15

C. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. -Genesis 22:18

The keypoint of the above promises of God made to Abraham is- that God would rise a universal prophet from the progeny of Abraham. Because all the above promises stress upon saying as-

'And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed'.

It is a well known fact that Abraham had two sons-

1. Ishmael the elder 2. Isaac, the younger.

No doubt that both the sons were blessed and the promises made were applicable to both of them in general; because both were the seed of Abraham. Accordingly the spiritual leadership was given to the progeny of Isaac the younger son of Abraham. A number of prophets one after another successively appeared from his progeny particularly for the Israelites, a great nation amongst whom the last prophet was Jesus. Thus the blessings and promises made to the

progeny of Isaac were fulfilled. When it is agreed that Jesus was the last link of the chain of Israelitic line of prophets, it is evident that no prophet was again to appear from the progeny of Isaac. As all these prophets were sent for the Israelitic tribes only further it implies, that as has been promised to Abraham, a universal prophet was yet to appear. Then therefore, the universal prophet was inevitably to appear from the progeny of Ishmael; the brethren of Isaac's progeny (Deuteronomy 18:18). We shall discuss this prophecy elsewhere.

As regards to this Jesus himself agrees with us in the interpretation for his parable of vine yard describing as -

Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scripture, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. -Matthew 21:42-43

Here the kingdom of God means the spiritual leadership.

NB: We shall discuss this prophecy in detail when we take up this as a separate one for discussion.

When God was well pleased with the sacrifice of his only son, He declared as here under.

And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son thine only son: -Genesis 22:16

Thus after swearing, God blessed him and promised a universal prophet to be sent from his progeny.

The universal prophet was to come from Ishmaelites - Jesus admitted

We know that Jesus was not the universal prophet but one, sent for the lost sheep of Israel (Matthew 15:24). But the promise is obvious to have been made for the universal prophet. Prophet Mohammad the descendent from the progeny of Ishmael was sent as a universal prophet. These points we have discussed in our another book '**That Prophet**'. Then therefore the above promise is proved to have been made for Ishmael and at the same time it discloses the fact that it was Ishmael who was offered in sacrifice.

And again let us examine the same in another way. While promising Abraham, God asked him to see the northward and the southward and the eastward and the westward, and promised that all that land would be given to his seed. This means that a universal prophet would come out of his progeny who would invite people towards the religion of God from all the quarters of the land.

We have a good reference from the saying of Jesus himself that this promise of God did not take place until his times; which further imply to mean that it would take place in the times of universal prophet who was to come after him.

Universal prophet establishes the kingdom of God- admitted by Jesus

And they shall come from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. -Luke 13:29

Here in this verse a noteworthy point is 'and shall sit in the kingdom of God'. From the study of the bible it becomes evident that the kingdom of God (Theocracy) was established in the time of Moses and continued under Joshua but later rejected by Israelites, which was to be restored again. From the study of gospel it is proved that Jesus had asked his disciples to pray for the kingdom of God to

come(Luke 11:2). That means until his time the kingdom of God (theocracy) had not yet been established on the earth. But prophet Mohammed established the kingdom of God (theocracy) on the earth where in all nations from all quarters of the earth joined. This is another authentic proof that the promise was made to Ishmael the first son of Abraham, from whose posterity the advent of prophet Mohammed took place.

God says 'Israel would none of me' - Jesus explains its reasons

And again Jesus' teachings clearly point out that the Israelites (the progeny of Isaac) were distarted from the right path and were following the traditions of their forefathers which however had no religious sanction. We have discussed as regards to these points very comprehensively in our another book- 'That Prophet'.

Now again examine that how these points further reiterated by John the Baptist.

And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham -Mathew 3:9

In the above verse it is explained that whoso rejoices himself as the son of Abraham cannot be the real son (in the sense as the follower of Abraham). Because if at all God wanted to multiply the seed of Abraham (only numerically) He could have made even the stones to become as the seed of Abraham. God does not want the number or the nominal professors or the claimants, but wants the real followers of Abraham.

most presumably, this was the reason why God declared as regarding them.

But my people would not hearken to my voice: and Israel (The progeny of Isaac) would none of me -Psalms 81:11

Now let us think about the christians the last branch of Isaac's progeny. The real seed of Abraham is he that really follow the relegion of Abraham.

What is the religion of Abraham?

The religion of Abraham is the perfect obedience to God.

An everlasting covenant was made between God and Abraham- the circumcision was commanded to Abraham.

And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou and thy seed after thee in their gerenations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And the uncircumised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath borken my covenant. -Genesis 17:9-14

Now come to the point. We muslims followers of Mohammed the descendant from the progeny of Ishmael undergo the circumcision as has been decreed upon Abraham as an everlasting covenant. But the christians who claim themselves to be the real seed of Abraham through the progeny of Isaac do not observe this everlasting covenant of God made with Abraham.

God says:

This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised -Genesis 17:10

Paul the founder of christianity says:

Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, christ shall profit you nothing -Galatians 5:2

God stressingly says:

And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised that soul shall be cut off from his people: he hath broken my covenant. -Genesis 17:14

Paul says:

*For in Jesus christ neither circumcision evaileth anything, nor uncircumcision: but faith which worketh by love.
-Galatians 5:6*

Now we leave this matter for the discretion of the readers to determine that who is really deserving to be called as the seed of Abraham whether muslims the descendants from the progeny of Ishmael or the christians the descendants from the posterity of Isaac.

Further Qur'an stresses upon the following:

A. And they say, 'Be ye Jews or Christians that you may be rightly guided. say: 'nay, follow ye the religion of Abraham who was ever inclined to God; he was not of those who set up gods with God. -Qur'an 2:135

B. When his Lord said to him, 'submit', he said, 'I have submitted to the Lord of the worlds'. -Qur'an 2:131

C. The same did Abraham enjoin upon his sons- and so did Jacob- saying: 'O my sons, truly Allah has chosen this religion for you; so let not death over take you except when you are in a state of submission. -Qur'an 2:132

D. And who will turn away from the religion of Abraham but he who is foolish of mind? Him did we choose in this world, and in

the next he will surely be among the righteous. -Qur'an 2:130

From the above it is noticed that God exhorted to follow the religion of Abraham. It does not mean that one should follow the religion founded by Abraham, but explicitly point out that one should follow the religion which Abraham had followed.

Then what is the religion that Abraham had followed?

It is mentioned in the above verses of Qur'an which reads as follows:

1. Abraham was ever inclined to God (2:135)
2. He was not of those who set up gods with God. (2:135)
3. He was obedient to God. (3:67)
4. He was reghteous. (2:130)
5. when his Lord said to him, 'submit' he said- 'I have submitted to the Lord of the worlds. (2:130)

The same religion he had enjoined upon his children, saying' -O my sons, truly Allah has chosen this religion for you: so let not death overtake you except when you are in a state of submission.' (2:132)

Had Muslims the descendants of Ishmael's progeny not inherited the spiritual leadership of Abraham's promises, could ever have a place been provided in their Qur'an for such verses as mentioned above?

Further while promisig Abraham, God said-

I will bless them that bless thee -Genesis 12:3

For the information of our readers I would like to mention that we Muslims, in our daily prayers pray God as follows:

... O Lord, shower thy mercy and blessings on prophet Mohammed as thou hast showered thy mercy and blessings on Abraham...

We think that these few points are enough to enlighten our readers so as to make them self-sufficient to decide whether the above promises in general and about the advent of the universal prophet in particular apply to the descendants from the progeny of Isaac or Ishmael.

Hagar the second wife of Abraham.

The church pronounce the above name HAAGAR 'G' as in 'Governor'. But we muslims call her name HAAJARA which can also be written as HAAGERA pronouncing 'G' as in 'George'.

Hagar of the church is a Hebrew word meaning for flight.

Hajara is an Arabic word meaning (v.t) to abandon, to forsake.

HIJRAH = (N) flight

HAAJARA = (V.i) to migrate

MUHAAJIR = (N) Emigrant, refugee.

However 'HAGAR' (flight) of the church and HAJARA (abandon, forsake) and HAAJARA (migrate) are one and the same in meaning. Because even as according to the church, the flight of one results in migration only. So the name of Hagar in all the different forms as stated above with its meanings are applicable to Hagar the second wife of Abraham; as we all know that it was Hagar who was

exiled to Bear-sheba. As regards to this we made an elaborate discussion in the previous pages.

Hagar a handmaid of Sarah? Concubine of Abraham?

The Biblical narrations as regards to her however do not give a clear picture whether she was a legal wife of Abraham or a handmaid of Sarah, who latter became a concubine of Abraham just to produce children for Sarah.

a. Sarah had a handmaid whose name was Hagar. -Genesis 16:1

b. I [Sarah] pray thee [Abraham] go in unto my maid [Hagar]: it may be that I may obtain children by her. -Genesis 16:2

c. And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac. But unto the sons of concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts and sent them away from Isaac his son while he yet lived... -Genesis 25:5-6

This verse speaks that Hagar was the concubine of Abraham.

Sarah longed to have children by Hagar for her and to achieve this objective she gave Hagar to Abraham to be his wife.

Thus we read:

d. And Sarah said unto Abraham, Behold now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto my maid: it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abraham hearkened to the voice of Sarah. And Sarah Abraham's wife took Hagar her maid the Egyptian, after Abraham dwelt ten years in the land of Canan, and gave her to her husband Abraham to be his wife. -Genesis 16:2-3

This verse explicitly points out that Hagar was a legal wife of Abraham but not a concubine or a handmaid.

Hagar a co-wife of Sarah and equal partner in the family

Now the question is that why Sarah had selected her handmaid to be her co-wife. Were there no freewomen from good families available? or nobody did come forward to be given in marriage with Abraham an old man of 85 years? or the freewomen were afraid to join the family of Abraham because of the wickedness of Sarah? (may God forbid). Whatever be the reason, the lot came in favour of Hagar to be the wife of Abraham a great prophet and friend of God. When once Hagar was given in marriage with Abraham (to be his wife), she was no more a handmaid were she really a handmaid, but became equal partner with Sarah, the first wife of Abraham in all the domestic affairs as well as all personal and private and public matters of the family, whatever might she be and her position before she was given to Abraham to be his wife.

Example: A post graduate is there. No doubt that in his childhood he was an elementary student. And in his boyhood he was a high school student. And in his youth he was a college student. And after passing through all these stages, he has come out successfully from his post graduation. Now the question is, can any sensible man treat him either as an elementary or high school student even though that it is an undeniable fact that he had passed through all these stages? So is the case with Hagar too. What was she before, is immaterial. But what was she after she was given to Abraham is a point to be taken into consideration. According to the following she was a legal wife.

*...and gave her to her husband Abraham to be his wife.
-Genesis 16:3*

This was the reason, why, when Sarah became disgusted with Hagar on some natural petty reasons that generally go with co-wives, Sarah realized her mistake of having given Hagar to be the wife of

her husband, and expressed her helplessness and grievances before Abraham in haste. As regards to this, we have in bible as here under.

And Sarah said unto Abraham, my wrong be upon thee: I have given my maid into thy bosom: and when she saw that she had conceived, I was despised in her eyes: the Lord judge between me and thee. -Genesis 16:5

The above verse and its relative other verses are tampered and substituted some passages in the support of fiction presented by the church to defame Hagar and her progeny. This point can be well perceived on going through our arguments right from the beginning. Yet let us agree with church and examine the logical points.

In reply to this Abraham said to Sarah as here under.

But Abraham said unto Sarah, Behold, thy maid is in thy hands do to her as it pleaseth thee. And when Sarah dealt hardly with her, she fled from her face. -Genesis 16:6

Though Hagar was no more a handmaid but a wife co-equal with Sarah, Abraham said as above only with an idea to appease Sarah; and to console her just as in the same way as Jacob presented himself as a servant of Esau his own brother just to appease him, which can be seen from Genesis 32:18-20 and 33:5,8,14,15.

1. Had Hagar not attained the status of a wife how could she had despised Sarah? (Whatever may be the reason).
2. Were Hagar still a handmaid, could Sarah had not sent her away? (without hesitation).
3. Had Hagar been given in the bosom of Abraham just to produce children for Sarah just in the degraded capacity of a concubine, could they have not waited till the eggs were fully hatched by Hagar? (Had Hagar despised her after her conception).

The answer for above all questions, in all probabilities, is nothing but, that Hagar was the second wife of Abraham, who was taken in legal wedlock just at the time, when the first one was proved to be a barren, Genesis 11:30-31, immediately after some time when she was taken into marriage with Abraham.

Had Hagar not really been given in marriage with Abraham, and had she not acquired the real status of a wife, could ever Sarah had felt and expressed her helplessness when she had found herself despised of as above? (Refer Genesis 16:5)

And again:

It is a matter of commonsense. However generous and liberal a woman may be, she can tolerate any thing for her but cannot even imagine the existence of another woman as her co-wife. But Sarah sacrificed and gave Hagar to her husband to be his wife (Genesis 16:3). Just for the fulfilment of her long desire for children, so that she might have children by Hagar (Genesis 16:2). She could have adopted any child. But she wanted to have an heir of Abraham through his own loins, even step son to herself...

...Behold now, the Lord hath strained me from bearing. I pray thee go in unto my maid: it may be that I may obtain children by her -Genesis 16:2

...and gave her to her husband Abraham to be his wife -Genesis 16:3

This point also gives sufficient proof that Hagar was the legal wife of Abraham and that Ishmael was his seed and legal heir.

Sarah was barren - Abraham wanted to have his heir from his own loins - so Hagar was taken as second wife, with the consent of Sarah

In a situation such as this, at the time, when her long desire was about to be fulfilled, and the fruit for which she had sacrificed the bosom of her husband to another woman- was about to fall in her hands, could she ever have dealt hardly with the tree that was yielding the fruit for her? or with the hen that was hatching the egg for her? Never. Therefore whatever passage or verse of the Bible or the gospel that contradicts to this logic can be termed only as additions subsequently made.

The church may defend this point by saying that Sarah was also blessed with a child. And therefore she was no longer in need of Hagar or her son.

We agree that Sarah was also blessed with a child of her own womb. But when?

Had she conceived just after the conception of Hagar and had Isaac been given to her immediately after the birth of Ishmael, it is but natural to get such sort of envious environment developed between the co-wives and the step brothers. But the case with Sarah is not like that. She gave birth to Isaac only after 14 long years after the birth of Ishmael. Therefore the plea of church in their defence as regards to this, is ruled out.

Some facts about Abraham's family

Let us bear in mind the following points:

1. Sarah was found barren. So it was determined that she could no more conceive.
2. Sarah and Abraham longed to have a child as their heir.
3. They did not like to adopt any child but he [Abraham] wanted to have a son of his own loins.

4. For this purpose, with the consent of Sarah, Hagar was taken as a second wife.
5. After a long long expectation, in his 86th year, Abraham was blessed with a child Ishmael.
6. One can imagine that how much affection and love that Sarah might have had on the child Ishmael for whose sake, she had sacrificed her husband's bosom to another woman. It cannot be exaggeration if we say with certainty in one word that she loved Ishmael more than his own mother herself.
7. Thus the child Ishmael became a delight of the eyes of all the house hold. He was an infant king with no crown of thorns in the family kingdom of Abraham. Thus was the situation when God wanted to try Abraham and asked him to desert Hagar along with the child.

Thus a trial was made by God to see whether their love and affection for God surpass the love and affection that they had on the boy.

Was this trial confined only to Abraham and Hagar? No. Sarah was also involved in it. This is how, truly speaking the affection and love that Sarah had on Ishmael was comparatively greater than the affection and love that Abraham and Hagar themselves had on the lad. Sarah really might have worried very much to get herself separated from the child even more than Abraham himself. Yet, in obedience to God's command she also extended her full cooperation with Abraham as did Hagar. Thus all the family members came out successful from the trial of desertion of Hagar and Ishmael. In this trial the role of Sarah and her sacrifice was most commendable, which can in no way be termed as lesser than any one else'. Basing on these facts and logic and reasoning it cannot be exaggeration if we

say that it was a greater trial for Sarah in disguise than the trial for Hagar and Abraham themselves. And this was why God well pleased with the sacrifice of Sarah and granted her also a son of her own from her own womb, though of late, so as to cool her eye. Indeed it was a suitable reward for her sacrifice. Thus not only her long desire for a child was fulfilled, but at the same time a great promise was also made. Thus it was in the plan of God to rise two great nations from the two sons of Abraham through two women respectively who are allegorically described as two covenants (Galatians 4:22-24)¹.

And God said unto Abraham, as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her and she shall be a mother of nations, kings of people shall be of her.

-Genesis 17:15-16

I invite the attention of our discerning readers towards the above clause of the verse (17:16)

... and give thee a son also of her.

In the literary aspect, the above clause speaks a lot that how God equated the status of Ishmael and Isaac as the seed of Abraham, and Hagar and Sarah as cowives (of Abraham) with no distinction between them however more church may try to exclude Ishmael and his progeny from the seed of Abraham and to snatch away Hagar from the bosom of Abraham.

Church is terribly afraid of Hagar and Ishmael

Despite all these facts the church argues that Hagar and Ishmael had no right of inheritance of the legacy of Abraham both spiritual or material whatever.

1. For it is written, that Abraham had two sons the one by a bondwoman, the another by a freewoman. ...for these are the two covenants.

So Let us for a while agree with the church that Hagar was only a bondmaid of Sarah who was given into the bosom of Abraham just to produce children for Sarah. But when Sarah was also blessed with a child Isaac, the need of Hagar and her son Ishmael was no more felt necessary. And more over Ishmael the son of handmaid committed a very great sin. That is while he was yet a boy mocked at Isaac the son of freewoman Sarah. And hence they were cast out. Thus there ended the matter of Hagar and Ishmael, Isn't it?

Were they really the ones that had no any significance and prominence, their names could never have been remembered. But their case does not seem to be so. As a matter of fact how many people are not begetting children through their concubines openly and secretly? Are all such off springs ever being remembered by people? But what made church to be afraid of Hagar and Ishmael?

Before going in to details, let us recall to our minds the incident that how all the twelve sons of Jacob whose (Jacob's) name was latter changed by God as Israel (Genesis 35:10) (8 sons by 2 wives and 4 sons by 2 concubines) became 12 tribes of Israelites.

Jacob (Israel) married the two daughters of Laban his maternal uncle. The first wife was Leah and the second Rachel. At the time of their marriage Leah was given a handmaid by name Zilpah and Rachel was given a handmaid by name Bilhah (Genesis 29:16-29). Rachel the younger was barren (Genesis 29:31). Leah gave birth to four sons one after another continuously (Genesis 29:32-35). So Rachel envied her sister Leah (Genesis 30:1) and gave her husband her handmaid, Bilhah to be his wife and she conceived and gave birth to two children for Jacob one after another (Genesis 30:4-8).

And again Leah gave her handmaid Zilpah to Jacob to be his wife to conceive as she ceased to bear. And Zilpah gave birth to two sons for Jacob. -Genesis 30:9-13

And again Leah conceived and brought forth two more sons to Jacob. -Genesis 30:17-20

Leah also delivered a daughter whose name was Dinah. -Genesis 30:21

Now the turn of the second wife Rachel came. God remembered her and opened her womb also and she conceived and begot a son Joseph. -Genesis 30:22-24

While on journey back to canan, Rachel while delevering another son died and father called his name Benjamin. -Genesis 35:17-19

Thus Jacob (Israel) was blessed with 12 sons and 1 daughter.

By Leah the first wife 6 sons.

By Rachel the second wife 2 sons.

By Zilpah (the handmaid of Leah) 2 sons.

By Bilhah (the handmaid of Rachel) 2 sons

Total 12 sons

All these are the twelve tribes of Israel: and this is it that their father spake unto them, and blessed them every one according to his blessing he blessed them. -Genesis 49:28

Thus the 12 sons of Jacob (Israel) became 12 tribes of Israelites who inherited the spiritual and material legacy of their father Jacob (Israel). No son whether he be the son of handmaid of first wife or the son of the handmaid of the second wife deprived of the inheritance. This speaks with authenticity that the biblical term for 'Gave her to be his wife' denotes to be given in marriage only but not keeping them as concubines.

However this further goes to prove that Zilpah and Bilha were

no more handwomen nor concubines. Yet church calls them as concubines only with the main idea to justify their calling Hagar as handmaid and concubine, or if they were really concubines of Jacob the words used in their favour 'gave them to be his wives' might have been added latter to diminish the real meaning of it in favour of Hagar and to create a misconception that she was only a concubine, and the words 'gave her to be his wife' were not used to mean as 'gave her in marriage'- but synonymously to mean for 'copulation' as in the case of Zilpah and Bilhah. Whatever they might be in fact, but what noteworthy is their (Zilpah's and Bilhah's) sons equally inherited and received the blessings of their father along with the sons of his own wives Leah and Rachel. If this be the case with bondwomen and concubines of Jacob (Israel) what made church to exclude Ishmael from Abraham's seed and to deprive him of his inheritance? Further, neither the first wife Leah nor the second wife Rachel had ever declared saying as 'cast out these bondwomen and their children: for the sons of these bondwomen shall not be heirs with our sons even with our own,' as we have an affirmative (positive) declaration recorded to have been stated by Sarah which reads as here under.

wherefore she said unto Abraham, cast out this bond woman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac. -Genesis 21:10

Keeping in view of the points discussed so far and considering the issue at hand with logic and reasoning- does the above decree which has been recorded to have been made by Sarah not prove beyond doubt, that it was not really made by Sarah but the interpolation added by the church itself in between the period of 650-700AD when the Muslim domination was getting a remarkable momentum both spiritually and geographically, whose spiritual leader Mohammed happened to be from the progeny of Ishmael? This was not done to create hurdles in the spread of Islam but with main intention to guard their own community so that it might not get attracted by the teach-

ings of Islam.

It is not our presumption. As regards to this the church has come out openly. Read the following passage in which the underlined verses are interpolated.

For this Hagar is mont sinai in Arabia and answereth to Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice thou barren that bearest not: breakforth and cry, Thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now we brethren, as Isaac was are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman but of the free. -Galatians 4:25-31

Even a cursery reading of the above passage can make one to derive at the opinion that how clear attempts are made to defame one branch (Ishmael) and up hold the supremacy of the another branch (Isaac) over the first. This is purely intended to create superiority and inferiority complexions between the branches (progeny of Ishmael and posterity of Isaac) of the tree (family) of Abraham; so that the Israelites (Jews and Christians) Isaac's progeny may feel proud of their blessed supremacy and hate the inferiority of the progenitors of prophet Mohammad and thus not to allow them (mainly christains) to look at or even hear the teachings of Islam.

INFERIORITY OF ISHMAEL/
DISADVANTAGES OF ISHMAELITES.

SUPERIORITY OF ISAAC/
ADVANTAGES OF ISRAELITES.

A. Abraham had two sons

One by handmaid. (Ishmael) other by free woman (Isaac)
-Galatians 4:22

NB: Thus in the very first instance the seeds of hatred were sown.
The racial division between the two sons of Abraham was made.
Superiority and inferiority complexion was created.

B. Born after flesh. Born by promise.

C. Covenants:

One from the progeny of Hagar. Another from the progeny
of Sarah.

D. Followers are in bondage to the law. Free from the bondage to
the law just as the above
Jerusalem is free.

E. Mother was desolated and so But we are having our fa
they have no father. ther Abraham.

F. They may be more in number But our status is greater,
as is written in the scripture,(4:27) because we are born after
Yet they are born after flesh. (4:28) Spirit.

G. They were cast out in the dust Because we are from free-
bin like rubbish (garbage). woman we are kept
honoured. (4:30)

H. Ishmael was not at all an heir But we are real heirs of
of Abraham. Abraham.

I. Ishmael persecuted Isaac. So also the progeny of
Ishmael persecuting the
progeny of Isaac.

Thus after explaining comparatively the merits and advantages
of Isaac and His progeny and alleged demerits and disadvantages of
Ishmael and his progeny, church once again reminds its followers
saying as...

*So then brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but
of the free -4:31*

This is to say in other words:

Brethren! let none of us pay heed to the teachings of Mohammad
that has come out of the progeny of a handmaid and he has no right
of inheritance with the promises made with our father Abraham and
the blessings which all we have now inherited (Romans 15:8). Are
you willing to join the fold of a handmaid? Are we not the children of
a freewoman and is not our mother Sarah's progeny a virtuous one
and greater in status than the progeny of one that had been desolated
and cast out?

So brethren!

What saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her
son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of
the free woman. (4:30)

This is to interpret:

Brothren! cast out the teachings of Mohammad as his progeni-
tors were cast out. Because as his progenitors could not become the
heirs of the promises, so also the progeny cannot become heir with
us.

Now observe the key verse (4:29) of the passage.

*But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that
was born after the spirit, even so it is now -4:29*

This to interpret as:

Then Ishmael persecuted :

Then Ishmael persecuted Isaac. Now the progeny of Ishmael (The followers of Mohammad) are persecuting the progeny of Isaac (the followers of Jesus).

'Even so it is now 4:29' means as Ishmael then persecuted Isaac so also now (at the time of Paul) the progeny of Ishmael (Mohammad's followers) is persecuting the progeny of Isaac (the followers of Jesus). One wonders as to how this thing has been recorded to have been taken place in the days of Paul. As a matter of fact the Muslims (the followers of Mohammad, the descendants from the progeny of Ishmael), came into being only after 610 AD. This is one example that how church added necessary interpolations according to its convenience. The professional preachers try to defend this as the prophecy by Paul. This is not a prophecy but a clear interpolation recorded to have been happening current in the times of Paul. Where were Muslims in the times of Paul? Does this singular point not prove that church had imputed some of the interpolations done by it to have been done by Paul in his own times?

Now let us go back again to our point whether Hagar was really a bondmaid and concubine as church defames her. Meanwhile let us have a glance over the accusation that church had made for the desolation of Hagar.

Ishmael mocked at Isaac: A mournful claim of church-

But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit... -Galatians 4:29

Thus church has accused that Ishmael persecuted Isaac.

On examination of the scriptures to find out where and how did

Ishmael persecute Isaac, it is noticed that Ishmael mocked at Isaac (Genesis 21:9) In our previous arguments it is proved that mocking of Ishmael at Isaac was only the latter thought development of the church. Even if we agree that Ishmael had mocked at Isaac, that too only once in his boyhood, is it so great a sin to term it as persecution?

Now let us recall to our minds that how great a heinous sin had been committed by one of the heads of the twelve tribes of Israelites.

Earlier to this we learnt that Jacob (Israel) had two wives and two handmaids as concubines. Of them Bilhah was the handmaid of Rachel the second wife of Jacob. The first son of Jacob by Leah the first wife, was Reuben.

Now what painful is that Reuben the first son of Jacob copulated with Bilhah the concubine of his father. That is to say in other words that he had lain down with his stepmother.

Thus we read in Genesis:

And it came to pass, when Israel (Jacob) dwelt in that land that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father's concubine: and Israel heard it. Now the sons of Jacob were twelve.
-Genesis 35:22

As regards to this the first thing that should be taken into consideration is, whether Reuben copulated with the concubine of his father or raped her. Examination of the verse reveals the fact that it was not a rape but an illegitimate copulation.

In rape the male is guilty while the female is helpless innocent victim. But in copulation both male and female are equally responsible for the sinful act. Because in copulation without the consent and willingness of the woman, one cannot copulate. Who seduces whether

male or female is not the question. One seduces and the other keeps tender attitude. One attracts and the other succumbs; one expresses the ambition and the other exposes willingness; one offers and the other accepts. Thus both male and female extend each other's co-operation in making the environments favourable to carryout the proposed copulation. So as regards to this we cannot find fault only with either of the male or of the female.

Now the question is- was the stepmother of Reuben not equally sinful?

Now what our question is- Is the mocking of Ishmael at Isaac a greater sin than of the concubine of Jacob lying with her stepson Reuben? Though Bilhah the concubine of Jacob committed such a heinous sinful act with her stepson, the church was not hurt and in its sight it was (is) so simple and a common thing as it were nothing. But as for the matter concerned with Ishmael- Simply because he mocked at Isaac it grieved the church very much and the church could not tolerate anymore to see the face of Hagar who gave birth to Ishmael and then therefore it passed a decree saying as- '*Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman*'.

In connection to this we cannot ignore how aptly Jesus had remarked saying as-

Ye blind guides which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel
-Matthew 23:24

And again if Hagar and Ishmael were ones that had no equal status to be in the family we would like to question the church that why the son of Isaac the elder one Esau married the daughter of Ishmael? (Genesis 28:9 & 36:3)

Does this act not prove that Hagar was not at all a handmaid of

Sarah and that Ishmael was not the son of concubine of Abraham as church brands them to be? And does this also not prove that they were not cast out unceremoniously by the decree of Sarah but they were sent to Beer-sheba in compliance to carryout the trial of God the exile of unweaned only child along with the mother Hagar as we stated earlier?

WAS HAGAR REALLY THE HANDMAID OF SARAH?

On examination of the points discussed sofar, the subtle acts that how church played to brand Hagar and Ishmael as ones that had no eminence at all in any respect, are unveiled. Then therefore we can say with certainty that she was not at all a handmaid of Sarah. But she was the handmaid of the Lord, in the sense as a submissive servant of God. We have a similar handmaid in the Gospel too.

That is Mary the mother of Jesus.

And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord: be it unto me according to thy word. And the angel departed from her.
-Luke 1:38

Diligent examination of the glad tidings given to the handmaid Mary and the handmaid Hagar by the angel of God brings out a very clear picture that shows the similarity and equality between Mary the mother of Jesus and Hagar the mother of Ishmael.

a. Angel of God appeared to Mary with a glad tiding that she was bringing forth a son-

And the angel said unto her, Fear not Mary: for thou hast found favour with God. And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son and shalt call his name Jesus.
-Luke 1:30,31

Similarly Hagar was also given glad tidings of a son:

And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold, thou art with a child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. -Genesis 16:11

'Because the Lord hath heard thy affliction'- can be interpreted to mean as-

Fear not Hagar for thou hast found favour with God.

b. Angel said with Mary:

And the angel came in unto her, and said, Hail, thou, that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. -Luke 1:28

Similarly with Hagar too: (in second time)

*...and Angel, said unto her, what aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is.
-Genesis 21:17*

Is it necessary to interpret that Hagar was also favoured highly by God and was one that was blessed among woman as was in the case of Mary?

Were she not favoured highly by God and were she not a one blessed among women the angel would not have called upon her twice on two different occasions with glad tidings from God saying as- *'What aileth thee Hagar? Fear not, for God hath heard the voice of the lad-'*

c. The angel said to Mary about her son

And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end. -Luke 1:33

Similarly the angel said to Hagar about her son Ishmael-

*And the angel of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude.
-Genesis 16:10*

And Again

... For I will make him a great nation -Genesis 21:18

d. As regards to the child (Jesus) of Mary

... and the grace of God was upon him -Luke 2:40

while God himself was with Ishmael the son of Hagar.

And God was with the lad... -Genesis 21:20

The above comparison made between Hagar and her child (Ishmael) and Mary and her child (Jesus) shows very clearly that what was the status of Hagar and Ishmael and that how great obedients were they in the sight of God.

If Hagar and Ishmael were ones that had no inheritance of the promises made to Abraham (Genesis 21:10) and if Hagar were after all only a bondmaid of Sarah (Genesis 16:1) and that Ishmael were a son of only a concubine (Genesis 25:5,6) and if they Hagar and Ishmael had no prominence at all-

we would like to ask the church-

Why Hagar was conferred with a favour of God who sent His angel on two occasions with glad tidings about Ishmael?

And why were a number of promises made by God about Ishmael?

Angel appeared to Hagar with a gladtiding and a promise to her son Ishmael.

And the angel of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude. And the Angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold thou art with child and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael: because the Lord hath heard thy affliction -Genesis 16:10-11

And again in the second time the angel appeared to Hagar and promised as follows-

And God heard the voice of the lad [Ishmael] and the angel of God called Hagar out of heaven and said unto her what aileth thee Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand: for I will make him a great nation. -Genesis 21:17-18

If Hagar and Ishmael were really the valueless stuff (Garbage) to be cast out into the dustbin as church made them out to be (ap-parent by their writings)-

1. Why the angel of God called upon Hagar twice on two different occasions with the glad tidings for her son Ishmael?
2. And why were promises made about her seed- Ishmael (and his progeny?)
3. And are also the promises made to Hagar about her son by God through the angel equally valueless to be thrown into the dustbin?
4. And do angels of God appear to ordinary people such as handwomen and concubines?
5. And do angels descend from heaven, to call upon people without any strong spiritual significance and purpose?

6. Does God select the names of such ones who have no spiritual significance and appoint his angels to advise their parents to name them after the manner as has been selected by Him?

Angel of God said to Hagar:

*...and shalt bear a son and shalt call his name Ishmael...
-Genesis 16:11*

Angel of God said to Mary

...and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. -Luke 1:31

Angel of God said to Zachariah:

...And thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son and thou shalt call his name John. -Luke 1:13

And God said to Abraham-

...Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac... -Genesis 17:19

We leave all these questions to the discretion of the discerning readers.

Above all what most important to note is, even if the angels of God appear to ordinary people the message they give cannot be free from spiritual significance and importance just as in the case of shepherds who were informed about Jesus (Luke 2:8-20).

Now let us examine some key verses of this passage under discussion so that we can know more about the progenitors of 'THE UNIVERSAL PROPHET-MOHAMMAD'

Isaac was born after promise - so also Ishmael was born after promise of God

a. But he who was by the bondwoman was born after the flesh: but he of the freewoman was by promise. -Galatians 4:23

1. According as to above it is a known fact that the bondwoman

means Hagar the second wife of Abraham that was given in marriage when the first wife Sarah was found to be a barren. (Genesis 16:1-3)

2. Freewoman means Sarah the first wife of Abraham, that who when she became despair of the hope of conceiving, gave Hagar to her husband Abraham to be his wife so that she could have children by her (Genesis 16:1-4).
3. Son of bondwoman means Ishmael (Genesis 16:15).
4. And the son of freewoman means Isaac (Genesis 21:3).

The above verse gives raise of a notion that Isaac was born by promise and that no promise was made about the first son Ishmael. But this is not correct. Both the sons were given to Abraham by promises only. Ishmael was also born by promise just as Isaac had been conceived of by a promise.

When God was giving a series of promises to Abraham, one after another, as Abraham was childless even upto his very old age, enquired God desperately that what was He going to give him, when he was going childless and expressed his reluctant desire to make one born in his house as his heir.

Then God promised and assured him that none could be his heir, except the one that was born out of his own loins. Thus was Abraham comforted and he believed in God and was expecting for a child (Refer to Genesis 15:3-6).

In due course (after 10 years Genesis 16:1-3) God conferred upon him the favour of the fulfilment of the promise and a son was born to him, by Hagar, whose name was Ishmael (Genesis 16:15).

Then does it not mean that Ishmael was also born to Abraham

only after promise?

As a matter of fact the promises made to Abraham were quite clear as they were specifically spoken pointing out to whom they aptly applicable to: whether to Ishmael or Isaac. No doubt the promises were made to both the sons of Abraham as they were his seed; and out of whom two covenants were to come (Galatians 4:22-24).

Promises of God to Abraham relating to Ishmael

1. At the time of commanding Abraham to get out of his country and father's house God promised him saying as-

And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great: and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. -Genesis 12:2-3

The key point of the above promise is that a universal prophet was promised to be raised from the seed of Abraham.

*A. ...and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed
-Genesis 12:2-3*

*B. And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed...
-Genesis 22:18*

C. ...for I will make him a great nation -Genesis 21:18

2. After Lot was separated from him, Abraham was again promised.

...and look from the place where thou art northward and southward, and eastward and westward: For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.

(please refer to Genesis 13:14-17)

This symbolic promise was also made for the advent of a universal prophet through his progeny.

3. when Abraham came to Mamre in Hebron in Canaan he was again promised.

After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward. And Abram said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus? And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and lo, one born in my house is mine heir. And behold, the word of the Lord came unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them; and he said unto him, so shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness. -Genesis 15:1-6

This promise was also of the same nature as of those that were earlier made. But here a son was promised that would inherit the promise for the advent of a universal prophet explicitly pointing on the hint 'He that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir'.

All the above promises speak clearly that Abraham was promised a son who would become the heir of the promise made to Abraham about the advent of the universal prophet who was to come from the seed of Abraham.

Hagar was taken as second wife soon after Sarah was detected to be a barren, even before all the promises were made - but not after Abraham had dwelt ten years at Canaan as church impress to mean as-

Eversince the promises of God made to Abraham not only abraham but also his wife Sarah was eagerly expecting for the fulfilment of the promise of God of a child.

If any man is promised of a son who is having only one wife it is

but natural that the wife will also be expecting to have a son from her bowels by her husband whom a son is promised. But here it is an open fact that Abraham had two wives. It is recorded in the Bible that Hagar (the second wife) was given to him after ten years after their dwelling at Canaan.

Thus we read in Genesis 16:3

And Sarai Abraham's wife took Hagar her maid the Egyptian, after Abraham had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan, and gave her to her husband Abraham, to be his wife.

Here it may be observed that why the specific mention of time (period) as regards to Hagar's company with Abraham as his wife was made, as to have been taken place as after ten years after Abraham had dwelt at Canaan.

According as to the present arguments it is not necessary to discuss whether Hagar was a handmaid of Sarah and whether she was given by Sarah or that Abraham himself had taken her as his second wife to keep up his progeny. But the more important point to know here is whether she was really given into the bosom of Abraham after ten years as recorded in the Bible. The other passages of the Bible which we shall put forth in the discussion as according to its necessity will reveal the fact that Hagar was not given really after ten years after their dwelling at Canaan but was taken as a legal wife even at the time when Sarah the first wife was detected and proved to be a barren even while they were at 'Ur of Chaldees' or at Haran long before the first promise of God was made.

And what is the motive behind on specifically and stressingly recording that she was given to be a wife after ten years after their dwelling at Canaan?

This has been interpolated so as to make people believe that

Hagar became the second wife of Abraham only after ten years after all the promises were made.

Here one may surprise as to why this silly point has become such a major factor as taken for discussion. Does it make any difference if she were to be given after the promises or before? Of course makes no difference in general matters but pertaining to the case of Hagar in this particular issue at hand, the point whether she was given in marriage after the promises were made to Abraham or before must be made clear.

It may be recollected that a number of promises were made to Abraham as regards to his seed and progeny. But to the great surprise, Abraham was not yet blessed with a child. So when again a promise was being made, Abraham desperately asked God that what was He going to give him, when he was going childless expressing his reluctant and unpleasant willingness to take one at last as his heir that would born in his house.

(we read in Genesis 15:2-3)

And Abraham said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus? And Abraham told, Behold to me thou hast given no seed: and lo, one born in my house is mine heir.

Then as a reply to the above, God clarifies as here under --

*And, behold, the word of the Lord came unto him saying, this shall not be thine heir: **but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.** And he brought him forth abroad, and said, look now toward heaven and tell the stars if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, so shall thy seed be. **And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for his righteousness.** -Genesis 15:4-6*

From the foregoing passage it is learnt:

1. That the heir of the promises made to Abraham was to come from his own bowels. Thus it is made clear that none could be his heir for the promise except the one that would come forth from his own bowels. Thus was stressingly said by God, and
2. that Abraham believed in the Lord; to say in clear terms that Abraham believed that as has been told by God that his real heir would be he that would come out of his own bowels. And again
3. that God accepted that what Abraham believed was a certain decree of Himself that was to take affect without fail.

God said that the heir of the promises would be one that would born out of Abraham's own bowels

What a curious fact is that if any person is promised of a son out of his own bowels and if he were a man of only one wife it is but natural that he should be expecting a son only through the womb of his only wife '*as he believed*'. But this was not the case with Abraham. He had two wives. The first one Sarah being a barren he took Hagar as his second wife to keep up his posterity. When Abraham was promised a son '*and he believed in the Lord*'. So his belief is to be considered as a main criterion to detect as to whom he believed as the mother of his heir whether Sarah or Hagar. And again one son cannot be expected from two wombs. So it must be either Sarah or Hagar to whom he believed as his heir's womb. But Sarah was barren (Genesis 11:30); and as a matter of fact this was the reason that why Abraham took his second wife Hagar. So without a doubt it was Hagar whom he believed as the mother of his heir.

A little manipulation - results in great loss

The above well established logic cannot be ruled out unless the existence of Hagar is out rightly denied as a consort of Abraham

before the times of all these promises were made. Therefore it is so interpolated to mean as that Hagar was given to be a consort of Abraham after ten years he had dwelt in Canaan. This was done purely with a malicious intention to make people believe that it was Sarah being the only wife, whom Abraham regarded and believed as the mother of his heir.

Hagar was taken as a wife to Abraham even before the first promise of a child

Though it is interpolated in the Bible as that Hagar was given to be a wife to Abraham after ten years of their dwelling at Canaan, we have so many other verses and passages which all not only contradict to this but also prove that she was taken into legal wedlock even while they were at Ur of chaldes, immediately after when Sarah was detected to be a barren (Genesis 11:30). As regards to her consortium with Abraham the chronological datum has not specifically been recorded. Yet what we can say with certainty is that Hagar became the second wife of Abraham even long before the first promise of God was made to him at Haran, or in the middle of the journey on the way to Canaan.

I would like to draw your kind attention on the following points.

while giving Hagar as a second wife to Abraham, Sarah expressed her fond desire for children.

...It may be that I may obtain children by her... -Genesis 16:2

This speaks-

1. ...the couple was very much desirous to have children for them.
2. ...the second wife was taken upon the mutual consent of the couple.

3. ...the second wife was taken only when it was determined that the first wife was not at all fit for conception.
4. ...the couple was not willing to adopt any child. The first wife Sarah wanted to have even step children out of her husband's own bowels even by her co-wife.
5. ...thus it became imperative to Abraham to accept the offer of his wife of the second wife to obtain children by her, as the first one was barren.

Now the question is whether Hagar was taken as a second wife after the promises of God were made or before. On observation of the Bible it can be well established that she was taken even before the promises were made.

Were Hagar the second wife of Abraham not existing in association in his consortium even before the promises of God were made and if there were only wife Sarah at the time when the first promise of God was made in the middle of the way to Canaan, regarding the multiplication of his seed, Sarah being a barren, should Abraham have not expressed his doubt as that how he could have a son from the womb of a barren, as he did when a specific promise for the birth of Isaac was made through the womb of Sarah in her old age?

We can see from the following that how great an impossible matter was it for Abraham to believe that Sarah would conceive.

Then Abraham fell on his face, and laughed, and said in heart, shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninty years old bear? -Genesis 17:17

The above may be about the improbability of conceiving in old age. If this be about menopause, does the improbability of conceiving not also applicable for a barren woman? Of course the proximity

of improbability between these two disqualifications runs parallel.

And again to make Abraham believe that Sarah would definitely conceive, God stressingly said-

...Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed... -Genesis 17:19

This shows clearly that till this promise Abraham had not even a vestige of thought that Sarah would conceive; because she was a barren at her youth (Galatians 4:27) and now menopause.

A known fact is that conceiving of menopause and barren are equally improbable. No doubt Abraham being a prophet, and friend of God, after God's stressing assurance believed that God could do anything and thus believed that he would get miraculously a son by Sarah. But his expression of doubt in the beginning when this specific promise was being made, reveals the fact that in all previous times when promises were made he did not express such doubt as this. Why? Not because that he was unaware of Sarah's barrenness but because he was having his second wife Hagar's consortium whom he took particularly to keep up his lineage by her. So when promises were made to him about his seed, he believed that he would get children by Hagar the second wife. This fact leads us to conclude that Hagar was taken into the consortium of Abraham even before these promises were made and that it was Hagar whom Abraham believed as the womb of his promised seed.

And again what surprising to note is that not only Abraham but Sarah also did not believe that she (Sarah) would conceive.

And he [angel] said, I will certainly return unto thee according to time of life: and lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son. And Sarah heard it in the tent door which was behind him. Now Abraham and Sarah were old and well stricken in age; and it ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women. Therefore Sarah laughed within herself saying, After I am waxed old shall

I have pleasure, my Lord being old also? And the Lord said unto Abraham wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old? Is anything too hard for the Lord? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life and Sarah shall have a son. -Genesis 18:10-14

Take note of the verse-

*Therefore Sarah laughed within herself saying, after I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, and my Lord being old also?
-Genesis 18:12*

This speaks very clearly that the couple was physically quite unfit to go through the natural phenomenon and inevitable process of cohabitation without which conceiving is generally not possible.

And the angel assures saying as- 'Is any thing too hard for the Lord? (Genesis 18:14)

This does not mean that God would renew their youth or restore the sexual appetite with necessary potentiality to go through the natural process necessary for conception; but rather mean to interpret that God was able of making Sarah conceive miraculously without the necessary cohabitation (sexual intercourse) just as in the case of Mary who conceived Jesus without all such general and natural process (Luke 1:34). This point goes to prove that it was a matter not possible for general cases unless God's extraordinary favour was conferred upon. Church also agrees that Isaac was born by Sarah miraculously (Galatians 4:29). Here what we want to point out is that Sarah until this event never believed that she would conceive.

And she [Sarah] said, who would have said unto Abraham, that Sarah should have given children suck? for I have born him a son in his old age. -Genesis 21:7

Thus she expressed, because in all her youth she was barren. The most noteworthy point here is that her above expression emphasises more on the point of her being barren in her youth rather than on her cessation of womanly nature in her old age. This point has also been corroborated by the church-

...Rejoice thou barren that bearest not... -Galatians 4:27

Does it mean that she [Sarah] did not believe right from the day she was given into the bosom of Abraham? No, not at all. She was expecting the favour of God of a child as do every married female and male. But what a curious fact is when she was proved to be a barren (Genesis 11:30) she gave up all such hopes and expectations and determined to take a fellow wife to herself so as to keep up legal posterity of Abraham.

Now Sarah Abraham's wife bare him no children: and she had an handmaid, an Egyptian whose name was Hagar. And Sarah said unto Abraham, Behold now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto my maid: it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abraham hearkened to the voice of Sarah. And Sarah Abraham's wife took Hagar her maid the Egyptian, after Abraham had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan and gave her to her husband Abraham to be his wife. -Genesis 16:1-3

The above passage provides in a nutshell that how and when and why that Hagar was taken as a second wife to Abraham.

'Now Sarah Abraham's wife bare him no children' of the first verse; and 'Behold now the Lord hath restrained me from bearing' of the second verse bear testamony to the fact that by that time Sarah was detected and proved to be a barren.

Further the words spoken by Sarah at the time of taking Hagar as her co-wife are most noteworthy.

'It may be that I may obtain children by her'. It explains very convincingly that Sarah expected that she would get children by Hagar. This further explains in very clear terms that Hagar was taken even before the first promise of God which was made at Haraan. Were it not so- could Sarah ever have taken another woman to be a wife to her husband to conceive children for her with no faith in God's promises? And could Abraham ever have accepted and taken the consortium of second wife to get children despite clear promises of God were they made earlier? Does this not speak in an unequivocal term that Hagar was taken as a second wife long before the promises of God, were made to them? As a matter of fact, taking of Hagar in to his consortium would not have necessitated the godly people like Abraham and Sarah when specific number of promises of God were made, had Hagar been not taken much more earlier than these promises were made.

And another noteworthy thing is that if Hagar was taken as second wife after the promises of God were made as recorded in the Bible, would God not have intervened and stopped Sarah and Abraham from taking Hagar for the sake of children? Let us recall here the event of God's sending glad tidings to Sarah saying that she would bear a son. On hearing the message of God Sarah laughed within herself with great surprise as that how she could conceive in her old age. To this God assured her through the same angel that it would be done indeed as nothing was impossible with God (Genesis 18:9-14). If thus was the reaction of God for the simple cause of expressing doubt by Sarah, what would have been the fate of them, had she offered another woman (Hagar) to obtain children by her even after a number of promises were made by God? What we mean to say in clear terms is that all these points prove that Hagar was taken as a second wife long before the promises of God were made when the first wife Sarah was detected and proved to be a barren. And then therefore it is proved beyond doubt that it was

Hagar whom Abraham believed as the womb of his promised seed.

Ishmael was legal heir to the promise of universal prophet

When once it is agreed that Ishmael was also born by a promise, now there arises a question whether Ishmael was a legal heir to the promise made to Abraham for the advent of the universal prophet from his progeny or Isaac as the church argues.

Now let us bear in mind that Abraham had two sons. The first one Ishmael who was born to him at his 86 years age. The second son was Isaac who was born to him later at the age of 100 years. So the age difference between the first and second son was 14 years.

Now the question is to whom do the earlier promises made to Abraham even at the time that no child was born to him reasonably applicable to- whether to the first born Ishmael or the latter born Isaac.

The church argues that all the promises made only about Isaac. But according to us, the promise to raise the universal prophet was to take effect from the lineage of Ishmael the first son of Abraham who was also born to him by promise of God.

This is how let us examine.

First reason is as follows:

Had those earlier promises been made about Isaac, there should have no fresh and specific promise been made again about Isaac.

... And I will bless her [Sarah] and give thee a son also of her: yea I will bless her and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her. -Genesis 17:16

The above is a promise made to Abraham specifically pointing about Isaac. Does it not clearly show that a fresh promise had been

made about Isaac? The church may try to explain this as a reminder or renewal of the earlier promises. But examination of the promise reveals the fact that it was neither a reminder nor renewal of the earlier ones but a new and fresh promise specifically made about Isaac. When once it is admitted so does it not logically prove that the earlier promises made before to this, in no way attract to the person of Isaac but to the first son Ishmael?

Further take note of the clauses of the passage...

And I will bless her [Sarah]

And give thee a son also of her...

Basing on the above two clauses of the passage a man with minimum literary knowledge can conclude that when this specific promise is made about the birth of Isaac with a stress on the above two clauses that all the former promises applicable to Ishmael the first son only, but the second son Isaac in no way concerned with them.

Example: I presented one golden chain to my friend asking him to adorn the same to his son. And accordingly he gave away the golden chain to the first son who was born 10 years after its presentation.

And after 13 years his another wife gave birth to a second son to him. If I were particular that the golden chain given by me should be given to the second son, I should have said to my friend to hand over the golden chain given by me to the second son explaining him clearly that it was meant for his second son only but not for the first son.

But quite contrary to this, before the birth of the second son, I prepared another golden chain and presented again to my friend

asking him to give it to his second son born to him by another wife.

Then does it not mean that the first golden chain was exclusively for the first son and the second golden chain for the second son? Is there any doubt still?

Exactly in the same way the promises made before the birth of the first son apply only to the first son Ishmael like the first golden chain meant for the first son of our example, as specific another promise was made about the second son just as the presentation of the second golden chain of our example.

If there were no separate promises made one before the birth of the first son and another one before the birth of the second son; and if there were no specific promises made about Isaac separately there could have been some doubt as to whom the earlier promise belongs to- whether to the first born Ishmael or the second one Isaac. But here the case is not ambiguous. Both the sons were separately promised. So at the first instance it is made clear that the promises made before the birth of Ishmael apply to him, and the further specific promises made about Isaac invariably apply to Isaac.

When once it is agreed as above the promise made before the birth of the first son to raise up of a universal prophet from among the seed of Abraham most reasonably and logically applicable to Ishmael only. And therefore that Universal prophet was to come from the lineage of Ishmael.

To uphold their arguments that all the promises made to Abraham even before the birth of the first son Ishmael applicable only to the second son Isaac, but not to Ishmael, the church has displaced a prophecy which speaks specifically about the progeny of Isaac (Genesis 15:13-14) and arranged it in between the order of promises made to Ishmael. This was done purely to rebut our above

point; and to create ambiguity among the promises made. But keeping in view of the facts discussed so far, the subtlety played can be well traced.

II Reason:

We have another hint in the scriptures to prove that all the earlier promises were made about Ishmael but not about Isaac.

While promising the birth of Isaac God changed the name of the first wife of Abraham.

*And God said unto Abraham, as for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah her name shall be.
-Genesis 17:15*

Why this change in her name was ordered, God Himself provides the answer in the following verse.

And I will bless her and give thee a son also of her: yea I will bless her and she shall be a mother of nations kings of people shall be of her. -Genesis 17:16

While specifically promising about Isaac God changed her name as Sarah instead of Sarai, explaining the reason. Were there any place for Isaac in those (earlier) promises the name of Sarai should have been changed as Sarah even at that time only when earlier promises were made.

To rebut our above point church forward the event of the change of the name of Abraham (Genesis 17:5) also. Were the change of name of Abraham a truth this might have been done even at the time of the first promise itself. So the mention of this event either here in this passage may be due to the wanted displacement or interpolation.

III Reason:

Abraham remained childless till his old age. God promised him of a son. He believed in God and it was counted as his righteousness. (Genesis 15:1-6)

Thus Abraham believed in God that the promises made to him would take affect in his seed.

The key point of the promise under (Ref. Genesis 12:2-3) is that God promised Abraham to raise a universal prophet from among his seed.

And again the promise under Ref. Genesis 13:14-17¹ is both symbolic as well as literal. It symbolizes for the advent of a universal prophet to be raised from Abraham's seed. And in literal sense- the greater part of the geographical territory would be under the control of the seed of Abraham. Accordingly the seed of Abraham inherited the land as promised to Abraham to be given to his seed- whether they be Jews and christians or Muslims.

As regards to the inheritance of land and property and such other things can be inherited by all seed (all members of his family or progeny) as according to what one is deserved or allotted by God as one's own lot. But as for the inheritance of the promise of the universal prophet he was to come from a single man because one prophet or person cannot come out of two wombs. Therefore this promise unlike the other ones applicable to only one person through whose lineage the advent of the universal prophet was to take affect to.

Progenitor of the universal prophet: Isaac or Ishmael?

1. ...lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward and eastward, and westward: For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever...

Now the questions is that from whose progeny the advent of the universal prophet was to take affect to- whether from Ishmael's as we argue or from Isaac's as church contends.

Now come to the point of our argument. Abraham had two sons. Elder was Ishmael and younger Isaac. The age difference between them was fourteen years.

At the time of these promises, as a matter of fact Abraham was childless.

Under Ref: Genesis 15:1-6 while again promising him of the universal prophet to clear off his despair of having no child God assured and promised Abraham of a son who would be his heir.

And he believed in the Lord... -Genesis 15:6

Thus the belief of Abraham became a criterion which helps in detecting the progenitor of the universal prophet as the same one as to whom Abraham believed.

Now the questions is- who was that seed (son) whom Abraham believed as the progenitor of universal prophet?

We must bear in mind that this promise was made to him when he was childless. As soon as the promise was made, he believed it. So it was the first son (Ishmael) whom he believed as the progenitor of that prophet as until after fourteen years after the birth of Ishmael there was no question of the existence of the second son Isaac. And so ever since Abraham was promised he was in the same belief.

The church object to this and say that because Abraham had only one wife Sarah by the time of these promises were made to Abraham, he believed that the promise was to be fulfilled through Saraha's womb as until after ten years there was no question of the

second wife Hagar. Then therefore the promise to raise a universal prophet was to come from the progeny of Isaac the first wife's son, but not from the progeny of Ishmael the son of the second wife.

Of course, this logic can be admitted provided there were only one wife Sarah at the times of all these promises. But the case here is not like that. Hagar the second wife was also present. Sarah was barren and this was the reason why the second wife Hagar was given in the bosom of Abraham to produce children for them. If this be the case is it not a fact that Abraham believed that he would beget his heir of the promise through the womb of Hagar the second wife? The presence of Hagar as a second wife to Abraham even before the times of all these promises were made- is proved in our previous arguments- please refer pages 64-74 just for arguments sake let us cooperate with the church for a while and accept that at the time of these promises Sarah being the only wife that Abraham believed that his promised heir would come out of the womb of Sarah. Were it so the first thing that we should take into consideration is that Abraham believed that the promise would take affect from the first son. His belief was not whether the first wife or the second wife or some one else give birth to his son (heir) but his uncofounded belief was on the point that the heir of the promise should be the one that would come forth out of his own bowels. This is what God had also made it clear saying -

...But he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir -Genesis 15:4

But what noteworthy is that God did not say- (At that time)

...Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed...

as had been said when specifically pointing about Isaac.
(Genesis 17:19)

If any man is promised of a son, who is having only one wife, it is but natural that the wife will also be expecting to have a son from her own womb by her husband whom a son is promised.

According to church at the age of seventyfive years when Sarah attained menopause, she became sure that she would no more conceive.

...the Lord hath restrained me from bearing. -Genesis 16:2

Until then Sarah might be expecting for the promised son through her womb. But what important to note here is that the belief of Abraham should be taken into consideration but not of Sarah's, because it is clearly said that Abraham's belief was accepted by God as his righteousness (Genesis 15:6).

Abraham's unconfounded belief in God's promise was that the heir of the promise made to him was he that would come forth out of his own bowels (Genesis 15:4). But his unconfounded belief was not that Sarah's womb would be the source through which his heir of the promise would come forth because he knew that Sarah was a barren (Genesis 11:30).

And this was the reason that why when Sarah became sure that she would no more conceive, and that when she was offering the Egyptian, Hagar to be his wife with a fond hope to keep up the posterity of Abraham and to have children for her through another woman Hagar, Abraham could not refuse to have another wife; but readily accepted to take Hagar as his second wife (Genesis 16:1-4).

If what we have said is not a truth Abraham would have definitely said to Sarah that he had believed in God that the heir of the promise of God would come forth from her[Sarah] womb only. And should have warned her not to be despair of conceiving with words

such as 'God hath restrained me from bearing'. And also should have rejected to have another wife saying that Sarah would definitely conceive a son for him the heir of the promise as he believed and the belief of which also had been counted by God as righteousness (Genesis 15:6). But quite contrary to this Abraham accepted the second wife Hagar. Does this point not prove that Abraham never regarded and believed Sarah as one the mother of his heir of the promise of God?

And again were it not so, and if Abraham had not believed his first son Ishmael to be the heir of the promise, could ever had he intervened when God was promising him the second son Isaac, and showed his contentment only with the first son expressing his reluctance to have another son?

We read in Genesis.

*And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai, thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her and give thee a son also of her: yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations: kings of people shall be of her. Then Abraham fell upon his face and laughed and said in his heart shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and Sarah that is ninety years old, bear? And Abraham said unto God, **O, that Ishmael might live before Thee!***
-Genesis 17:15-18

Does this not speak that Abraham was not at all fondly hoping to have another son?

Does this not prove that what all promises were made to Abraham (Except those specifically made latter about Isaac) were made in favour of Ishmael?

Does it not prove that Abraham believed those promises which all speak about the advent of a universal prophet to take affect from the off spring of the first son Ishmael? by Hagar?

Was that belief of Abraham a mere false prediction? or delusion? No. What he believed, God counted it as his righteousness (Genesis 15:6). In other words God approved and affirmed that what Abraham believed his son Ishmael to be the progenitor and heir of the promise for the raise of a universal prophet was quite right. When God Himself had affirmed it, then where is chance for any other interpretation? Can there be any place for all such verses or passages that speak contrary to this fact?

IV. Reason is as follows:

Now let us discuss in an another way. Examine some verses of the passage under discussion (Galatians 4:21:31)

A. Now we brethren as Isaac was, are the children of promise (Galatians 4:28).

In the very beginning of this chapter we have proved in our arguments that Ishmael was also born by a promise. So if the descendants of Isaac the Israelites (Jews and christians) were by promise, the case with Ishmaelites (Muslims) was also by promise. Here the promise is used in literal sense only which is applicable to both sons.

B. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit... -Galatians 4:29

Whether one was persecuted by the other is a point of secondary importance, while the verse provides two important facts. These are-

1. that Ishmael was born after flesh means, he was born after the natural phenomenon of human intercourse which resulted in his mother Hagar's conception. Thus Ishmael's birth was a normal and natural one (Genesis 16:1-4).

2. but the case with the birth of Isaac was not like that. It was quite unnatural and abnormal. He was born after the spirit. That means he was born miraculously without the interference of parent's natural necessary copulation without which conception is not possible. The mother of Isaac, Sarah was not only a barren but also had attained menopause, yet God gave them a son by name Isaac, miraculously. Nothing is impossible with God. He can create children from the stones or even from nothing.

1. *And think not to say within yourselves we have Abraham to our father: for I [John] say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. -Mathews 3:9*

2. *And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. -Genesis 2:7*

When God is able of raising up of children to Abraham even from stones, why one wonder or hesitate to believe that Isaac was born miraculously? Was the case of Isaac unique of this type? No. We have similar cases one with John and the other with Jesus. We have discussed these point in detail in our other book 'THAT PROPHET' which may be referred to so as to understand the points easily.

So it is proved beyond doubt that the birth of Isaac was a miraculous one while the birth of Ishmael was just a natural one. And this fact is also admitted by the church (Galatians 4:29).

Cast out bondwoman and her son - scripture says?

C. *Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bond woman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. -Galatians 4:30*

In the above, Paul reminds in his letter to Galatians saying as 'Nevertheless what saith the scripture?' as if, to impress that what

was he going to write was already incorporated in the scripture. Our readers well remember that we have proved in our arguments under the sub-heading 'The Exile' in pages 5-17, that what has been recorded to have been decreed by Sarah (Genesis 21:10) was no more than an interpolation. Whether it was recorded in the original manuscript is a point to be left for the discretion of the readers, but what one can notice is that church is very particular to cast out Hagar and her son Ishmael from their memories by reminding again and again to its followers. And those who hanker after such passages disclose themselves as ones responsible for such interpolated passages. If not why one should emphasize on those parts (writings) repeatedly?

The decree of Sarah to cast out the bondwoman and her son Ishmael whether a fact or fiction is not the point now to be discussed, but what we primarily point out is even if it were a truth, the event happened some thousands of years ago, and accordingly they might have been cast out and the matter there ended, and became a thing quite forgotten. Now what we would like to question the church is that why is it so afraid even to see the shadows of the debris of the graves of them which are no more traced any where?

Bondwoman's son was the real inheritor of the promise - as he was born out of the bowels of Abraham

Church has inserted the interpolation and imputed to have been decreed by Sarah and reminds once again by saying- 'What saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman' (Galatians 4:30). Let us not worry whether it is a truth or interpolation made by the church to derogate the posterity of Ishmael out of whom prophet Mohammad happened to be the universal prophet; so as to guard their sheep and not to allow them to scatter and enter into the field of Mohammed. If what we say is not a truth why is

church so afraid of even to hear the name of Ishmael? And why are they not able to forget them? If they were once cast out whom church is going to cast out again in commemoration of the casting out of Ishmael and his mother if it is not an unceasing trial of the church to cast out the teachings of Mohammed so as to guard their own people not to become his followers?

What ever be these things but what we primarily need is whether Ishmael was son of Abraham or not?

God says in Bible:

...because he is thy seed. -Genesis 21:13

Now the question is that who was the real seed deserving to inherit the promise for the universal prophet- whether Ishmael or Isaac?

When Abraham was childless he was promised by God-

...he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. -Genesis 15:4

In the above, a son was promised and at the same time it was also made clear that no one could be his heir except the son that would come forth out of his own bowels.

We do not mind that who would inherit the worldly wealth such as movables and immovables, but we are particular to find out that who would inherit the spiritual universal leadership promised to Abraham through his seed.

By the time of promise Abraham and Sarah might not have had in their knowledge that Abraham would be blessed with two sons. But can anybody think that it was not in the knowledge of God? It is needless to write that God being the Creator and Master of all the

worlds without whose knowledge no leaf of any tree falls, knew that Isaac was to follow after fourteen years after the birth of Ishmael.

The most remarkable point here to discuss is that when God was aware of the fact that Abraham was to be blessed with two sons that why he had used the singular number while promising- '**a son**' as his heir for the universal spiritual leadership?

(He that shall come forth...)

Then therefore even though Abraham had two sons the promise is applicable to only one son.

Now the question is who that son was whether Ishmael or Isaac?

In our foregoing pages we learnt that Ishmael was born after flesh means- born by means of natural phenomenon of cohabitation of his parents. That means Ishmael was born out of the bowels of Abraham (Genesis 16:4), while Isaac was miraculously born that means he did not come out of the bowels of Abraham but by the mercy of God he was born. These points have also been admitted by the church (Galatians 4:29).

Now we leave this point for the discretion of the readers to whom the promise reasonably applicable to:

...he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. -Galatians 15:4

From the above verse a crucial hint that one who was to inherit the promise of the universal prophet can be seen. That is to say that one who is born out of his own bowels is the progenitor of the universal prophet. The church attributes the inheritance to the second son Isaac, the progenitor of Jesus so as to ascribe this promise to

1. Genesis 25:12-13 2. Genesis 16:3 (to bewife) 3. Genesis 16:11

Jesus himself. But the examination of the various biblical narrations help us to find out whether it was the first son Ishmael or the second son Isaac as the real progenitor of the universal prophet. In view of the above hint he must be one that had been born out of the bowels of Abraham. In this connection please observe the following-

*But as he who was born according to the flesh then persecuted him who was born according to spirit even so it is now.
-Galatians 4:29*

The above passage is taken from the letter of Paul to Galatians. Taking into consideration of the context it can be well explained that the one who was born according to the flesh was Ishmael and the other one was Isaac who was born according to the spirit. We find in this passage two allegoric descriptions about two births of two sons respectively. The first one was born out of flesh meaning born out of parents' own bowels. The other son was born according to spirit means born miraculously without the natural process necessary for conception which point makes clear that the second son was not born out of his father's own loin (bowels). This further establishes that the first son was born out of his own bowels which point makes clear that it was the first son who was the progenitor of the promised universal prophet. So it is evident that the first son Ishmael was the progenitor from whose progeny the advent of the universal prophet was to take place.

ISHAMEL: THE PROGENITOR OF THE UNIVERSAL PROPHET

Ishmael is a word in Hebrew language meaning for 'God hears'. The first son of Abraham¹ by Hagar the second wife² was named as Ishmael as suggested by God Himself through His angel³. He was so

1. Genesis 28:8-9

2. Genesis 17:15-21

named because God heard the affliction of his mother.

Affliction of Hagar - Not because she was dealt oppressively by Sarah: but because she remained unproductive

And the angel of the Lord said unto her [Hagar] Behold thou art with child and shalt bear a son and shalt call his name Ishmael: because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. -Genesis 16:11

In the above verse God discloses the reason for the affliction of Hagar as 'for having been remained unproductive' revealing as 'Behold thou art with child and shalt bear a son' and suggested the name as Ishmael to mean God had heard her affliction. This point convincingly proves that the reason for Hagar's affliction was not because she was dealt oppressively by Sarah as recorded under Genesis 16:3-6.

And another point from the above passage is that God says through His angel 'Behold thou art with child'. This goes to prove that until after she was informed by the angel, she did not know that she had conceived. If this be the fact where is the chance to say that she had despised Sarah after knowing that she had conceived as recorded under Genesis 16:3-6? Here one may object and argue that merely basing on the statement 'Behold thou art with child' it cannot be admitted that she was not in know of her conception as we say. Such words as these for example, 'Behold you are a married woman... not a child', can be said only to emphasise on the point of her elderliness only but not as an information about her having been already given in marriage. Yes, of course we do admit this. But taking into consideration the whole passage and the sum and substance of our coming arguments one has inevitably to accept that the affliction of Hagar was not because she was dealt oppressively by Sarah. She had a respectful treatment in her family- Then therefore no question of despising and no question of hard dealing with her. Thus our argument

sustains.

The angel of God while informing Hagar that she was with child, explains her the three characteristic features of the child as-

1. And he will be a wild man.
2. His hand will be against every man and every man's hand against him.
3. And he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren. (Genesis 16:12)

Now let us discuss the above three characteristics.

Ishmael a wild man: Urdu and Telugu versions interpreted to mean as 'a man like wild ass'

1. And he will be a wild man- what was really meant by 'A wild man' is traceable as 'a man who was an inhabitant of desert or wilderness' as recorded in the following passage.

And God was with the lad and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran: and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt -Genesis 21:20-21

But to the great surprise the Telugu and Urdu versions interpreted the phrase 'a wild man' as to mean in English as 'He will be a man like wild ass'.

If he were really a man like a wild ass could Hagar have not enquired the angel that what was the favour that God was going to confer on her by giving her such a son as one no better than a wild ass?

If the phrase 'He will be a wildman' were taken to mean as 'He will be an unruly and unprincipled man' it also does not stand true because Esau the first son of Isaac had married the daughter of Ishmael¹. If he were really a man possessing the nature of a wild ass or an unruly and unprincipled one, could ever Esau had married his daughter?

And another more important thing is - when Abraham was being promised of another son Isaac by Sarah he shows his reluctance to have another son by expressing his contentment only with the first son Ishmael by Hagar². What we pin point from this passage is that if Ishmael were a wild man to mean either as unruly man or just as a man with characteristic nature of a wild ass (as recorded in Telugu and Urdu versions) would ever have Abraham showed his contentment saying as- '*O that Ishmael might live before thee!*' [why another son Isaac?]. Then therefore the phrase under question can inevitably be taken to mean as 'He will be called a man who dwelt in wilderness' as recorded in the passage (Genesis 21:20-21) which has a great significance with another prophecy of Deuteronomy 33:2

2. *His hand will be against every man and every man's hand against him.*

This is to mean as saying that he will be against to all peoples and all peoples will be against him. We learnt from the former pages that a universal prophet was promised to Abraham from his progeny³. It is an established fact that prophets were sent for reforming the people. The work of reformation evidently falls against the then prevailing practices of the people. Prophets cannot compromise with the wrong practices of the people, but openly condemn them. Thus every prophet becomes against to the people to whom he is sent. Except this promised universal prophet, all other prophets were sent

1. Genesis 28:8-9

2. Genesis 17:15-21

3. Genesis 15:3-6

to the communities to which they belonged. But the case with the promised universal prophet from the posterity of Abraham the father of all nations was not confined to any particular people or nation but for all peoples and nations². Thus it is allegorically stated that Ishmael's hand will be against every man and every man's hand against him. In brief this clause implies as the reminder of the promise of the universal prophet from Abraham's posterity through Hagar's lineage. To say in clear terms that the advent of a universal prophet would take place from Ishmaelites.

AND HE SHALL DWELL IN PRESENCE OF ALL HIS BRETHREN

This clause has a great significance with another prophecy which speaks that God would raise them up (Ishraelites - Abraham's progeny by Sarah) a prophet from among their brethren (Ishmaelites - Abraham's progeny by Hagar) Deuteronomy 18:18. This prophecy is discussed in the coming pages.

We can see from the passage (Genesis 16:1-9) the reasons which necessitated Hagar for her flight from her house to the place of wilderness where the angel of God appeared:

Synopsis of the passage Genesis 16:1-9

1. Sarah gives Hagar to her husband to be his wife so as to have children by her.
2. Hagar conceives. And as a result of this Hagar despises her mis-

1. A. Because as according to Luke, they brought him to Jerusalem after her days of purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished (Luke 2:22)

B. Days of purification for male child - 33 days
Days of purification for female child - 66 days (Leviticus 12:1-8)

tress Sarah.

3. Sarah disputes with Abraham- complains about how she is despised by Hagar. Abraham gives permission to deal with her [Hagar] as she [Sarah] pleases. And she deals intensely with Hagar and hence she flees from her presence (Genesis 16:6).

Hagar had a high reputation in her family as well as in the community

These reasons as recorded in the passage appear to be after thought development of the church to curtail the status of Hagar in the sight of general public. This point has been proved in convincing manner in many places of our previous arguments. Had she really been oppressively dealt by Sarah, it is evident that she might not have had any place of reputation in her family except as a bondmaid. But contrary to these likely misconceptions Hagar had a remarkable reputation in her community as well as in her family.

1. The fountain of water in the wilderness where she met the angel of God was named after the manner she uttered- as 'Beer-Lahai roi' (Genesis 16:13-14).
2. Abraham named her (Hagar's) son 'Ishmael'. This is the name suggested by God through his angel to Hagar. She might have told all this event to Abraham and accordingly he named his son which was born to Hagar as 'Ishmael- to mean as God hears'. This shows that Hagar had a significant reputation in her family and her word was regarded as gospel truth (Genesis 16:15).

The points so far discussed prove that what all derogatory or defamatory statements are found in the Bible against Hagar and

1. I Kings 11:18

3. Numbers 12:16+ 13:1-3+ Acts 10:37

2. Galatians 4:24-25

4. Numbers 24:1

Ishmael are mere interpolations subsequently added. The manipulations of the church played an enormous role in concealing the facts.

A clue about the person of universal prophet: He was to come from Egyptian origin

Now let us recall to our minds the events and promises made to Abraham in favour of a universal prophet who was to appear from his seed through the lineage of Hagar (i.e) Ishmael and how they correspond with the prophecies made in different places through different prophets.

The advent of a universal prophet as promised to Abraham through Hagar's progeny was reminded through many prophets. Let us discuss a few of them.

1. *when Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. -Hosea 11:1*

From the above prophecy we can find a clue about the advent of the universal prophet.

The clue: He was to come from Egyptian family... *(and called my son out of Egypt.)*

We have a corresponding information in Numbers 24:8 *God brought him forth out of Egypt.* Now let us examine who was it that came from Egyptian family whether Isaac or Ishmael.

Sarah was a chaldean (Native of Ur, chaldees) Genesis 11:28,29

Isaac's wife was also chaldean. (Native of Ur, of chaldees.)
Genesis 24:4

Hagar was an Egyptian (native of Egypt) Genesis 16:1

1. Exodus 3:18

2. Genesis 21:21

Ishmael's wife was also an Egyptian. (Native of Egypt)

Genesis 21:20-21

And God was with the lad (Ishmael) and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran: and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. -Genesis 21:20-21

Thus it is proved that the universal prophet was to come from the progeny of Ishmael but not of Isaac.

But the church tries to attribute the above prophecy (Hosea 11:1) to the person of Jesus, a descendant from Isaac's progeny by advocating that no sooner was he delivered at Bethlehem, than his parents took him to Egypt for fear of infanticide by Herod the then king and brought to Israel after a few days after the death of the king. Luke makes no mention of taking the child Jesus to Egypt- He was born at Bethlehem and remained there upto the end of her days of purification and then came to Jerusalem 2:1-7+22. If this be the fact, can the prophecy that *'I called my son from Egypt'* be applicable to Jesus who was born from a non Egyptian origin, at Bethlehem merely because he was taken to Egypt for tentative abode not more than a few days. (Matthew 2:1 and 13-15)¹

We leave the matter for the discretion of our readers whether the prophecy applies to one that comes from the progeny of Ishmael having an Egyptian origin or from the progeny of Isaac whose origin goes to chaldees (?)

We know that the wilderness of Paran (Beer-sheba) was an uninhabited place where Hagar and Ishmael were exiled to. There the angel of God appeared to Hagar and gave glad tidings that how her son Ishmael would become a great nation.

And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation,

because he is thy seed. And Abraham rose up early in the morning and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hager, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba. And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bowshot: for she said, let me not see the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lift up her voice, and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, what aileth thee, Hagar? fear not; for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise lift up the lad, and hold him in thine hand: for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water; and she went, and filled the bottle with water, and gave the lad drink. And God was with the lad: and he grew, and dwelt in the wilderness, and became an archer. And she dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. -Genesis 21:13-21

Thus the wildness of Paran became a city¹. And all his progeny spread all over the surrounding land known as Arab with great spiritual significance². Thus Paran can be identified as a place belonging to another nation different from Canaan (Judea)³. Prophets used to set their faces towards it while they perform any spiritual rite⁴.

In that wilderness the Hebrews (all Jews means all the twelve tribes of Israelites) used to offer sacrifices⁵. Thus abundant spiritual prominence has been accredited to it.

Another clue: He was to come from Mount Paran

We have another corresponding prophecy which focusses upon the supremacy of Mount Paran-

N.B: This prophet was (is) Universal Prophet who was (is) to be believed by all nations. Hence he was not a prophet particularly for Israelites. Just information was given of him to them.

1. I King 11:18

2. Galatians 4:24-25

3. Numbers 12:16 + 13:1-3 + Acts 10:37 4. Numbers 24:1 5. Exodus 3:18

And he said 'The Lord came from Sinai and rose up from seir unto them: he shined forth from Mount Paran and came with ten thousand of Saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. -Deuteronomy 33:2

Similar prophecy:

God came from teman, and the Holy one from Mount Paran. -Habakkuk 3:3

On examination of the prophecy, we can find that the person who was to come with a fiery law was to come from the Mount Paran. This makes clear that he was to come from the lineage of Ishmael, because it was he (Ishmael) who dwelt in the wildness of Paran². Wilderness of Paran (Genesis 21:21) and Mount Paran (Deuteronomy 33:2) may be taken as one place to mean as a mount in the wilderness of Paran just as a Mount on which Moses was given law is called a Mount in the wilderness of Sinai(Exodus 19:1,3).

One more clue: He was to give law:

From his right hand went a fiery law for them. -Deuteronomy 33:2

Another distinction of this prophet is that he should give a law.

After Moses no other prophet did give law- as all prophets that followed after him followed the law given by him only.

For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus christ. -John 1:17

The above verse makes clear that as many prophets (including Jesus) as appeared after Moses, all had followed the law given through him (Moses).

And what a curious fact is that Jesus was the last of the proph-

ets of the chain of Israelitic prophets. And the prophecy speaks that one fiery law was to come from the right hand. Then therefore it is evident that Universal Prophet with a fiery law was to come from Ishmaelites. Now let us examine an another prophecy which confirm these two points- those are

1. Law was to come
2. from Ishmaelites.

I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.

-Deuteronomy 18:18-19

The above prophecy was told to Moses. Here God promised that He would raise a prophet like unto Moses. What do the clauses such as-

1. like unto thee...
2. I will put My words in his mouth...
3. He shall speak all that I shall command him...

mean to convey as- Like unto thee means like unto Moses. He was a prophet through whom a law was given on Mount Sinai to Israelites. So also the promised prophet should give a law. This is the similarity between that prophet and Moses (*like unto thee*). Further two clauses also emphasise on the point of giving law.

He was to come from Ishmaelites

Let us see whether he was to come from Israelites or Ishmaelites.

The prophecy under discussion provides a good hint to prove that he was to come from Ishmaelites.

Clue: I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren...

The pronouns, we see as underlined above- 'them' and 'their' represent to israelites. Hence brethren of the prophecy represent to Ishmaelites. Then the complete prophecy means to read as-

God will raise up a prophet for Israelites from ishmaelites¹.

But church not only contradict our argument but also try to rebut by saying that 'That Prophet' was to come from the brethren of Israelites means - 'From among Israelites themselves' they contend thus. Here one must know that the advent of the prophet of the prophecy (Deuteronomy 18:18) was made to all the twelve tribes of Israelites; that is to say that all Israelites as one community. If that prophet were really to come from the Israelites, the term of the prophecy should have been to read as- 'I will raise them up a prophet from among themselves' but should not be under any circumstances as- '*from among their brethren*' which clause speaks of some other community. Who else could have been the brethren of Israelites other than Ishmaelites? Two nations and communities Ishmaelites and Israelites came from two progenies one from Ishmael and the other from Isaac, two brothers respectively (Galatians 4:22).

LAW WAS TO COME

In this regard let us have a close examination of the passage-

And he said, The Lord came from Sinai and rose up from seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran and he came with ten thousands of Saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them. -Deuteronomy 33:2

A part of prophecy recorded in past tense - a glaring manipulation

We find this passage to have been recorded in past tense which concludes to mean that all the terms of it had already been fulfilled. Then therefore there remains no question of looking forward for the fulfilment of any of the points mentioned therein. But analytic study of the passage, keeping in view of other prophecies as recorded in various places reveals that it is partly spoken about the incidents which already had happened and the other part as an exposition with an addition of three more points to the prophecy as made mention in Deuteronomy 18:18-19. As we said the other part of the (prophecy) passage under discussion provides the clue to identify the progenitor of 'That (universal) Prophet' (Deuteronomy 18:18)¹ and the place (country) from where he was to come which can be taken as an independent prophecy by itself or as mere exposition of the prophecy under reference [Deuteronomy 18:18]¹

First part of the passage.

The Lord came from Sinai... -Deuteronomy 33:2

This was said about two events; one in which Moses was commissioned with prophetic office on Mount Sinai before going to Egypt to release the Israelites from the slavery of Egyptians. And the other relating to the event in which he was given law on the same mount-Sinai, after their exodus on the way to Canaan. In both events the glory of God was seen. In this way it is said that 'the Lord came from Mount Sinai...'

But should be in future tense - its reasons

Now let us examine the second part of the passage. *He shined forth from mount Paran and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them.* This part is a prophecy and hence

1. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him... -Deuteronomy 18:18-19

it should have been recorded in future tense on the following reasons.

Points that are to be taken into consideration

1. The context clearly says that it has been said by Moses himself.
 2. It was Mount Sinai where he was given law but not Mount Paran. But here he speaks about a person that came (was to come) with ten thousands of Saints and with a fiery law from Mount Paran. Then therefore this part of the passage in no way can be attributed to Moses himself.
 3. This- he said after the accomplishment of the events of the appearing of God's glory on Mount Sinai- *'The Lord came from Mount Sinai...'*
 4. And we cannot find at anywhere in Bible a person with ten thousands of Saints with fiery law had ever appeared. Therefore this was yet to take place in the then following future only.
 5. So it must be taken only as a prophecy but not as an event which had already been given effect to.
- Basing on these facts it should have been recorded in future tense only but not in past tense as has been done.
6. Further it may be taken to mean that Mount Sinai and Mount Paran are two distinct places of one region symbolic for the country wherefrom the advent of that prophet was to take place.
 7. Then therefore this speaks that it is only an exposition of the promised prophecy of God which he (Moses) made vide Deuteronomy 18:18¹.

8. So the second part of the passage under discussion should have been recorded in future tense only but not in past as no evidence of any event of giving the law from Mount Paran had ever taken place, prior to its saying.

And further if it is argued that it refers to the manifestation of divine glory on Mount Sinai, subsequent clause 'he shined forth from Mount Paran, would not have been said, as the then Divine glory came from Mount Sinai only but not from Mount Paran. What our contention is that the Divine Glory was to appear from Mount Paran which point should have been mentioned in future tense only but not in past as till then no divine glory appeared from Mount paran. This is another reason that why the second part of the passage should have been mentioned in future tense only.

Some explain the clause- '*he came with ten thousands of saints*' - as a figurative description of the ten commandments given to Moses. Then therefore it refers to Moses only. But this argument is dampened by its successive clause- '*from his right hand went a fiery law for them*'. If ten thousands of Saits are taken to mean as the ten commandments of the law, further stress on saying '*from his right hand went a fiery law for them*' should not have been added.

Some try to attribute this passage as a prophecy about Jesus by taking the meaning of 'ten thousnds of saints' as simile for remaining ten disciples out of twelve of whom one berayed jesus and the other one repudiated his being a disciple. But further clause '*from his right hand went a fiery law*' disqualifies the contention as Jesus had not given law, but followed the then Mosaic law (Mathew 5:17) and ordained his followers to follow it meticulously (Matthew 5:17-20). Thus it is made clear that ten thousands of Saints cannot be the ten commandments of the law nor can be attributed to the disciples of Jesus. Then therefore it may be taken for granted to have been said by Moses about the advent of a prophet that was to come after him

as promised by God in [Deuteronomy 18:18] with an additional information focussing on his successful mission with great number of his dedicated followers and the place of his advent as Mount Paran. Then therefore it must be taken as an exposition on the prophecy by Moses. A prophecy or its exposition always speaks of the events to be taken place in future. This is one more reason why the second half of the passage should be only in future tense but not in past tense.

As regards to the second clause of the first part '*...and rose up from Sier unto them:*' appears to be of no greater significance than mere passing of Moses and his company through Seir after receiving the law on Mount Sinai en-route to Canaan.

Thus we read from Deuteronomy :

Then we turned and took our journey into the wilderness by the way of the Red sea, as the Lord spake unto me: and we compassed mount Seir many days. And the Lord spake unto me, saying, ye have compassed this mountain long enough. turn you north ward. And command thou the people, saying, ye are to pass trough the coast of your brethren the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir: and they shall be afraid of you: take ye good heed unto yourselves therefore. Meddle not with them: for I will not give you of their land no, not so much as a foot breath: because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau, for a possession. Ye shall buy meat of them for money, that ye may eat: and ye shall also buy water of them for money that ye may drink. For the Lord thy God hath blessed thee in all the works of thy hand: he knoweth thy walking through this great wilderness: these forty years the Lord thy God hath been with thee: thou hast lacked nothing. And when we passed by from our brethren the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, through the way of the plain from Elath and from Ezion-Gaber, we turned and passed by the way of the wilderness of Moab.

-Deuteronomy 2:1-8

Some Muslim Theologians opined this Seir to be the place which covers the area where Jesus had preached. But to my poor geographical knowledge it does not seem to be correct. In this regard, if my view point is found to be incorrect I may be provided with necessary information and guidance for which I shall be indebted to.

LAW WAS TO COME FROM RIGHT HAND

Before we take up the second part of the passage, which is a prophecy, let us think of its last clause- 'From his right hand went a fiery law for them'. When once it is agreed that it is a prophecy, it should be recorded only in future tense. And this is what is being discussed all about. Then the clause is to be read 'from his right hand will come/go a fiery law for them. This speaks of a prophet that was to come after Moses with a law. It does not mean that prophets after Moses had not come. A number of prophets did come. But they were all annotators and followers of the then existing Mosaic law only. But here the argument is about a law giving prophat. And when it is read together with its former clause 'He shined forth (will shine) from Moun Paran'- it discloses the place from where that prophet was to come.

Taking this clause (fiery law from right hand), and comparing with the following two verses of the Qur'an church further argues that the second part of the passage also speaks of the events relating to the manifestation of divine glory only which appeared on Mount Sinai and hence no prophet was ever to come. We do admit that Moses was given law on the right side of the Mount Sinai. But what our contention is that this clause- 'Right side of the Mount Sinai' in the present context, relates to the second part which pin points on the progenitor of that prophet and of the place of his advent.

Let us examine the Quranic verses which speak of right side- and the commentary on the relevant points so as to find out the importance of the 'Right hand' or Right side'

PROPHETIC OFFICE COMMISSIONED TO MOSES ACCODING TO QUR'AN

And we called him from the right side of the Mount and made him draw near to us for special communion. -Qur'an 19:52

The above passage speaks of the event in which Moses was commissioned with the prophetic office even before the exodus of Israelites from Egypt. It refers to Exodus 3:1-17. He was called from the right side of the Mount. There, in that event, the law was not given, but was only bestowed with prophetic office. This is what is meant by- '*and made him draw near to us for a special communion*'. This point we have discussed in the beginning.

LAW GIVEN TO MOSES

O children of Israel, we delivered you from your enemy and we made a covenant with you on the right side of the Mount and we sent down on you Manna and Salwa. -Qur'an 20:80

This passage speaks of the event in which Moses was given law after the exodus of Israelites from Egypt, on the same Mount. Here also he was called from the right side of the Mount. Thus according to these two Quranic references, two significant events have been given effect to, on one and the same Mount. In the former one Moses was bestowed prophet hood while in the latter, the law was given. Both events happened only on the right side of the Mount where the Divine Glory manifested, the point which exalts the spiritual significance of the right side of the Mount Sinai.

Now the point is that both in Bible and Qur'an the words such as 'from his right hand' and 'right side of the Mount' have been high lighted. Law does not come from hands to discriminate the right hand or the left but comes from the mouth only. The case of Moses is exceptional from all other law recievers. He was given writtten

tables of law. [Deuteronomy 4:13 Exodus 24:12 and Qur'an 7:145]. But what our contention here is that the 'right hand' or 'the right side' represents more on the region (place) which falls to the 'right hand' or 'right side' of the Mount Sinai, wherefrom the promised prophet was to come with a fiery law than on any thing else. And furthermore its spiritual significance has been multiplied by the biblical information saying as 'ye shall serve God upon this Mount' (Exodus 3:12) and God says to Moses put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where on thou standest is holy ground (Exodus 3:5).

Both according to Qur'an and Bible, Sinai is the Mount situated in the region of Midian, the place of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses. It is not the region of Canaan but lies in between Egypt and Canaan. The Bible identifies it as Arabia. *'For this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia'*. This speaks very clearly that the Mount Sinai is in Arabian country and Midian is its region (Exodus 2:15 + 3:12).

Sinai is the Mount situated in the land of Midian

Thus it is evident that a prophet from Arabia was to come who would bring them a fiery law. However this point adversely affects the church as it regards the law as a curse and has excluded the law from the law of God (Galatians 3:13 + 23-25). And another thing is if they accept this they tend to accept that prophet which is an act of suicide on its part.

Prophet Jesus' advent was from Palastine but not from Arabia. Then therefore the term of the prophecy which is under discussion cannot be twisted in favour of Jesus. So the whole passage has been articulated to read in past tense so as to attribute it to Moses and thereby to avoid adverse consequences that may pose naturally if it is recorded exact in the form as it had been originally revealed.

Commentaries of Mr. Abdullah Yusuf Ali- About Sinai and its right side and Paran

Now let us know about Sinai and its right side and Paran- from the commentaries of Mr. Abdullah yusuff Ali, a renowned Arabic scholar and Qur'an translator in English language with commentary.

1. Abdullah Yusuff Ali writes in his commentary on the verse 20:10 under note no. 2542.

The spiritual history of Moses begins here. It was his spiritual birth. His physical life, infancy and upbringing are referred to later on, to illustrate another point. Moses when he grew up left the place of Pharaoh and went to Midionite people in the Sinai Peninsula. He married among them, and was now travelling with his family and his flocks, when he was called to his mission by God. He went to look for a fire for comfort and guidance. He found a higher and holier comfort and guidance. The whole passage is full of the highest mystic meaning which is reflected in the short rhymed verses in the original. Both the rhythms and the meaning suggest the highest mystery.

2. Commestary on 19:52 under note 2504.

The incident here I think refers to the incidents described more fully in 20:9-36 a reference may also be made to Exodus 3:1-18 and 4:1-17. There is a great deal of mystic meaning. The time is when Moses (with his family) was travelling and grazing the flocks of his father-in-law Jethro just before he got his commission from God. The place is somewhere near Mount Sinai (Jabal Musa). Moses sees a fire in the distance, but when he goes there, he hears a voice that tells him 'it is sacred ground'. God asked him to put off his shoes and to draw near. And when he went near, great mysteries were revealed to him. He was given commission, and his brother Aaron was given to him to go with him and aid him. It is after that he and Aaron went and faced Pharaoh in Egypt, as narrated in 7:103-144 etc. The right side of the mountain may mean that Moses heard the voice from the right side of the mountain as he faced it; or it may

have the figurative meaning of 'right' in Arabic, ie, the side which was blessed or sacred ground.

3. Commentary on 20:40 under note 2563

Years passed. The child grew up. In outward learning he was of the house of Pharaoh. In the inner soul and sympathy he was of Israel. One day he went to the Israelite colony and saw all the Egyptian oppression under which Israel laboured. He saw an Egyptian smiting an Israelite apparently with impunity. Moses felt brotherly sympathy and smote the Egyptian. He did not intend to kill him but infact the Egyptian died of the blow. When this became known, his position in Pharaoh's household became impossible. So he fled out of Egypt and was only saved by God's grace. He fled to the Sinai Peninsula, to the land of the Midianites, and had various adventures. He married one of the daughters of the Midianite chief and lived with Midianites for many years as an Egyptian stranger. He had many trials and temptations, but he retained his integrity of character.

4. On verse 20:40 under note: 2504

See last note. After many years spent in a quiet life, grazing his father-in-law's flocks, he came one day to the valley of Tuwa underneath the great mountain mass of Sinai called tur (in Arabia). The peak on the Arabian side (where Moses was) was called Horeb by the Hebrews. Then was fulfilled God's plan: he saw the fire in the distance and when he went up, he was addressed by God and chosen to be Gods messenger for that age.

5. Commentary on 20:77 under note 2599

Time passes and atlast Moses is commanded to leave Egypt with his people by night. They were to cross the Red sea into the Sinai Peninsula. They were told to have no fear of Pharaoh, or of the sea or of the unknown desert country of Sinai into which they were

going. They crossed dry shod, while Pharaoh who came into pursuit with his troops was overwhelmed by the sea. He and his men all perished. There is no emphasis on this episode here. But the emphasis is laid on the hard task which Moses had with his own people after he had delivered them from Egyptian bondage.

6. Commentary on 20:80 under note: 2601

Right side: compare 19:52 and note 2504 toward the end. The Arabian side of Sinai (Jabal Musa) was the place where Moses was first received his commission before going to Egypt and also where he received the law after the exodus from Egypt on the way to Canaan.

7. Commentary on 28:44 under note 3376

The Sinai Peninsula is in the north-west corner of Arabia. But the reference here is I think to the westren side of the valley of Tuwa. Mount Tur, where Moses received his prophetic commission, is on the westren side of the valley.

8. Commentary on 2:246 under note 277

The next generation after Moses and Aaron was ruled by Joshua, who crossed the Jordan and settled the tribes in Palestine. His rule lasted for 25 years, after which there was a period of 320 years when the Israelites had a chequered history. They were not united among themselves and suffered many reverses at the hands of the Midianites, Amelekites and other tribes of Palestine. They frequently lapsed into idolatry and deserted the worship of the true God. From time to time a leader apeared among them who assumed dictatorial powers. Acting under a sort of theocratic commission from God, he pointed out their backslidings, reunited them under his banner and

1. ...these are two covenants: the one from mount Sinai... For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia...

restored from time to time and place to place, the power of Israel. These dictators are called judges in the English translation of the old testament. The last of their line was Samuel who marks the transition towards the line of kings on the one hand and of the later prophets on the other. He may be dated approximately about the 11th century B.C.

We quote below some references from the Bible relevant on the subject which are helpful to check the correctness of the points relating to geographical information as provided so far.

Some biblical references, which coordinate with the Qur'anic verses and its relevant commentaries relating to geographical information as provided:

- a. *...But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh and dwelt in the land of Midian... Exodus 2:15*
- b. *Now Moses kept the flock of Jethro his father-in-law the priest of Midian: and he led the flock to the backside of the desert and came to the mountain of God, even to Horeb. -Exodus 3:1*
- c. *And the Lord said and to Moses in Midian, go return into Egypt: for all the men are dead which sought thy life. -Exodus 4:19*
- d. *And he said, draw not nigh hither, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place where on thou standest is holy ground. -Exodus 3:51*
- e. *And he said, certainly I will be with thee, and this shall be a token unto thee, that I have sent thee; when thou hast brought forth the people out of Egypt, ye shall serve God upon this Mountain. -Exodus 3:12*

- f. *And they took their journey from Elim, and all the congregation of the children of Israel came unto the wilderness of sin which is between Elim and Sinai on the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt. -Exodus 16:1*
- g. *In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day came they into the wilderness of Sinai. -Exodus 19:1*
- h. *The Lord came down upon mount Sinai on the top of the mount: and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the mountain: and Moses went up. -Exodus 19:20*
- i. *These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai. -Leviticus 27:34*
- j. *And afterward the people removed from Hazeroth and pitched in the wilderness of Paran. -Numbers 12:16*
- k. *And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, send thou men, that they may search the land of Canaan which I give unto the children of Israel: of every tribe of their fathers shall ye send a man every one a ruler among them. And Moses by the commandment of the Lord sent them from the wilderness of Paran... -Numbers 13:1-3*
- l. *These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on this side of Jordan in the wilderness in the plain over against the Red sea, between Paran and Tophel, and Laban and Hazeroth and Dizahab. -Deuteronomy 1:1*
- m. *Remember ye the law of Moses my servant which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments. -Malachi 4:4*
- n. *And the children of Israel took their journeys out of the wilderness of Sinai, and the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran. -Numbers 10:12*

Ascertained information by the Qur'anic and Biblical quotations when compared-

From the commentaries on Qur'anic verses relevant to the subject on hand, and the Biblical quotations as recorded above bring out the precise and concise information as mentioned below.

Biblical Midian or Qur'anic Madyan, is a place where Moses dwelt after he fled from Egypt. Exodus 2:15 Qur'an 28:22

Horeb the mountain of God, -Exodus 3:1-20

is where Moses was commissioned with prophetic mission.

God's Glory was seen on Mount Horeb. -Exodus 3:5

Hence it is a holy place where one should not tread on with shoes. But put off as a mark of respect to God.

On this Mount -Exodus 3:12

Israelites should serve God probably as a mark of gratitude for having been delivered from the bondage of Egyptians.

Mount Horeb is Mount Sinai -Malachi 4:4 + Leviticus 27:34

Mount Sinai is also called Mount Horeb. This is the Mount where Moses was bestowed with prophetic mission and also the law was given to Israelites.

Note: The Holy Mount of God, Horeb or Sinai is in the land of Midian. And Midian is the region of Arabia. Paran is a wilderness region in the Sinaitic peninsula. Therefore Mount Sinai, Mount Paran, Midian the regions of Arabia.

Exodus 19:20 Leviticus 27:34 Numbers 12:16, 13:1-3 and

Galatians 4:24-25

A UNIVERSAL LAW WAS TO COME FROM THE PROPHET LIKE MOSES FROM ARABIA

Now let us turn towards the second part of the passage under discussion.

'He will shine forth from mount Paran' -Deuteronomy 33:2

When once it is made known that Paran is the region of Arabia, it is evident that the prophecy (second part of the passage Deuteronomy 33:2) speaks of a prophet that was to come from Arabia. The former part of the passage shows that Moses was commissioned with prophetic office and law also was given on one and the same mount Sinai which is also situated in Arabian territory. Thus the whole passage (Deuteronomy 33:2) speaks of two laws of which one was already given on mount Sinai, and the other was promised to be given from mount Paran. However both mount Sinai and mount Paran are situated in the Arabian territory. It is one more point that focusses on the similarity of that prophet with Moses (... *a prophet like unto thee* -Deuteronomy 18:18) just as Moses was given law in the Arabian territory, so also one who was to come in the likeness of Moses was also to be given law in the same territory. As the former law was given to Moses, it is evident that it came from the progeny of Sarah (Isaac) and the latter one was to come from the lineage of Hagar (Ishmael). As regards to this we have a good reference in the annotation of Paul in his epistle to -Galatians 4:22-25

For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by bondmaid [Hagar], the other by freewoman [Sarah] ...for these are the two covenants [laws].

The promised universal prophet who was to come from the progeny of Ishmael by Hagar to Abraham had to appear from Paran-

the region of Arabia. He had to give a universal law as after him there comes no prophet.

Thus one covenant (law) came from mount Sinai and the other was promised to be sent from mount Paran.

...he shined forth from mount Paran -Deuteronomy 33:2

...and the Holy one from mount Paran. -Habakkuk 3:3

Hearken unto me, my people: and give ear unto me, O my nation: for a law shall proceed from me and I will make my judgment to rest for a light of the people -Isaiah 51:4

God reminds here of the promised law which was to come after Moses. As it was being reminded through the prophet Isaiah it is made clear that the second law had not yet come upto the time of prophet Isaiah. So the promised law as made through Moses (Deuteronomy 18:18) had yet to come.

And many nations shall come and say, come and let us go upto the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his path: for the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. -Micah 4:2 (also refer Isaiah 2:3)

As according to Moses, he was promised by God that He would raise up a prophet just in the likeness of Moses himself from among Israelites' brethren (Deuteronomy 18:18). We have already discussed this prophecy. But basing on mere these words people may not understand that another law would come again as already a law was given through Moses. And so to make it clear that a law would indeed come, it is again informed by Moses under the prophecy Deuteronomy 33:2 that the law giving prophet would come from Mount Paran who would give a fiery law. This prophecy has also been discussed. Prophet Isaiah also reminded that God would send

a law.

...For a law shall proceed from me. -Isaiah 51:4

In addition to the above reminder the same point has once again been prophesied by Isaiah under ref . 2:3 as mentioned in the above passage. The same prophecy, in verbatim, repeated by the prophet Micah under reference 4:2 also. Thus in these two prophecies the place from where that universal law giving prophet had to come has been mentioned symbolically saying as Zion.

...for the law shall go forth of Zion.. -Micah 4:2

...for out of Zion shall go forth the law -Isaiah 2:3

The word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

Thus the law was to come from Zion and the word means the promise of God as made in Isaiah 7:14 a symbolic description of Jesus' advent is informed. As regards to Zion we shall discuss else where.

New law would come only when Mosaic Law would completely be broken

Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. (31)

Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt: which my covenant they brake, saith the Lord. (32)

But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts; and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people (33) -Jeremiah 31:31-33

The above is a prophecy made through the prophet Jeremiah stressing on the point of giving a new law (covenant). It is a reminder of the prophecy of Moses under reference Deuteronomy 18:18. Moses was a prophet who gave the law to Israelites and at the same time he prophesied about another law to be given through that prophet Deuteronomy 18:18 and 33:2.

In the above prophecy of Jeremiah God says- '*... I will make a new covenant*' means a new law will be given which will supersede the old one given by Moses. It is mentioned in the prophecy clearly that only when the law of Moses would be completely broken, then the new law would be given '*which my covenant they broke*'. Now let us have a glance over Moses' law that how it was broken. Jews were partial in law (Malachi 2:9). They observed the easier matters but heavier laws were disobeyed

... because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. -Isaiah 24: 5

And they bend their tongues like their bow for lies; but they are not valiant for the truth upon the earth: for they proceed from evil to evil, and they know not me, saith the Lord.

-Jeremiah 9:3

Qur'an confirms in the following verse.

And surely among them is a section who twist their tongues while reciting the Book, that you may think it to be part of the Book, while it is not part of the Book. And they say, it is from Allah; while it is not from Allah; and they utter a lie against Allah, knowingly. -Qur'an 3:78

Later Christians regarded the law as curse- (Galatians 3:10-13). Thus after the complete decline of the Moses' law, the promised law through that prophet (Deuteronomy 18:18) would be given. This speaks clearly that only after Jesus that the universal prophet would come through whom the universal law would be given.

And what noteworthy points from the prophecy are-

1. *I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts and*

2. *I will be their God and they shall be my people.*

The first point is the symbolic assertion showing that the community of that universal prophet consists of great number of people who commit the Qur'an to memory. This is the meaning of God's saying- '*I will put my law in their inward parts: and write it in their hearts*'. Thus we find in Muslim community hundreds- nay thousands of 'Huffaaz'- the people who committed Qur'an to memory. This practice (tradition) has been coming right from the days of prophet Mohammad and will continue (if God be willing) for ever. And the second part is- '*I will be their God and they shall be my people*'- meaning that this community does not call themselves as the sons and daughters of God as Israelites and Christians do but insist on calling themselves as slaves (Ibadi) and prefer to call God as their Master and creator but not as Father.

... and will be their God and they shall be my people.

-Jeremiah 31:33

But he shall be a sanctuary: but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (14) And many among them shall stumble and fall and be broken and be snared and be taken. (15) Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples. -Isaiah 8:14-16

For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by bondmaid the other by freewoman... for these two are the two covenants ... for this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia...

-Galatians 4:21-22

Thus Paul gives his clear annotation on the subject, that the

promised prophet (Deuteronomy 18:18) was to come from the lineage of Hagar (Ishmael) who dwelt at Paran. (Deuteronomy 33:2)

And the God was with the lad [Ishmael] and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and his mother [Hagar] took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. -Genesis 21:20-21

...and called my son out of Egypt. -Hosea 11:1

...God brought him forth out of Egypt. -Numbers 24:8

Thus the place as Arab, wherefrom the promised law was to be given on mount Paran, is disclosed. Now let us find out the progeny through which that prophet of the prophecy was to come. Paul says that Abraham had two sons- one by Hagar, Ishmael and the other by Sarah, Isaac. And further says that these two women are two covenants [laws]. From our arguments, it is proved that Moses was given law on mount Sinai. Thus the covenant (law) which was to come through the progeny of Sarah has been fulfilled. Then therefore the law which was to come through the progeny of Hagar was to come from mount Paran- means Arab. After Moses, no man from Arab had ever claimed that he was giving law in the capacity of the last prophet except the prophet of Arab, Mohammed, whose lineage went to Ishmael the first son of Abraham by Hagar.

Mohammad is not the father of any of your men but (he is) the apostle of God and the seal of the prophets; And God has full knowledge of all things. -Qur'an 33:40

All Israelitic prophets spoke Hebrew

Thus these two progenies settled in two different nations namely Arab and Canaan, whose languages naturally differ which point is needless to write.

All Israelites were Hebrews- meaning Hebrew speaking people

(Exodus 3:18, 5:3)

God spoke to Moses on mount Sinai (Exodus 3:2-6)

In which language did God speak with Moses? It must be only in Hebrew as he was a prophet to Hebrews.

Abraham, the Hebrew -Genesis 14:13

Moses, a prophet for Hebrews. -Exodus 2:11

Jesus spoke Hebrew -Acts 26:14-15

...I heard a voice speaking unto me and saying in the Hebrew tongue... I said, who art thou, Lord? And he said I am Jesus...

Paul, the founder of christianity spoke Hebrew - Acts 21:40

...And when there was made a great silence, he spake unto them in the Habrew tongue saying...

This speaks that as many prophets as appeared in the Israelites all spoke Hebrew language and the books given to them were revealed in the same language.

A Law was to come from Ishmaelites- Arabs

Whom shall he teach knowledge? And whom shall he make to understand doctrine? them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts (9) For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept: line upon line, line upon line: here a little and there a little. (10) For with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people. (11) To whom he said, This is the rest wherewith ye may cause the weary to rest: and this is the refreshing: yet they would not hear. (12) But the word of the Lord was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line- here a little and

1. Please refer our another book 'The Profile of Paul'

there a little, that they might go and fall backward and be broken and snared and taken. (13) -Isaiah 28:9-13

In another tongue.

Another tongue of the above passage connotes for some language other than Hebrew. To ascribe this prophecy to Jesus and his gospel, Church in vain tries by the inscription as 'translated out of the original Greek.' Did Jesus ever preach in Greek language? No. But he spoke Hebrew only which point can be noticed from Matthew 27:46 Acts 26:14-15 etc., So it can be well defined that the Hebrew was the original language of the scripture taught by Jesus, though not instantly recorded in his life time. Later if the gospel were brought in any other language, may it be Greek or Latin- other than Hebrew these languages can be termed as only translations of the original Hebrew language in which the scripture was taught but not written for any extraordinary reasons there of.

...and another tongue will he speak to this people -Isaiah 28:11 means, God will give His law in another tongue. It is the repetition of the prophecy (Deuteronomy 18:18) where in it is said that He would raise up a prophet from among the brethren of Israelites (ie) Ishmaelites. Ishmaelites are Arabs. And accordingly Qur'an has been revealed in Arabic tongue. Thus the prophecy has been fulfilled in prophet Mohammad who gave Qur'an in Arabic tongue.

And verily this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds. The spirit, faithful to the trust has descended with it-on thy heart, that thou mayest be the warners, in plain and clear Arabic tongue. And it is surely mentioned in the scriptures of the former peoples. -Qur'an 26:192-196.

As regards to another tongue God makes a stress in the following prophecies too in a very specific manner.

A. Lo, I will bring a nation upon you from far, O house of Israel,

saith the Lord; It is a mighty nation, it is an ancient nation, a nation whose language thou knowest not, neither understand what they say. -Jeremiah 5:15-16

In the above prophecy we have three important points to be noted-

1. nation that would come was ancient corresponding to Ishmaelites- '*a nation from far*' is symbolic to mean that 'That Prophet' was to come from another nation but not from among yours (theirs)
2. one that speaks another tongue- this corresponds to the point '*...and another tongue will he speak to the people*' of the prophecy Isaiah 28:11 under discussion.
3. and '*it was a mighty nation*'- all these points correspond to the exposition of Jesus on this prophecy in his parable of vineyard.

Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits there of. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder. -Matthew 21:42-44

Note: We have the same parable in Luke 20:9-18 wherein we find Jesus saying that the vineyard would be given to others. On hearing this they say '*God forbid*'. This point clearly explains that the kingdom of God would be transferred to Ishmaelites from the Israelites. This point is further confirmed by Jesus asking as '*what is then that is written, the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?*' The stone which the builder rejected means - Ishmael.

...the same is become the head of the corner means Ishmael becomes the progenitor of the universal prophet. This is the Lords doing means it is the decree of God. In other words this is to say that the universal prophet would come from Ishmaelites.

B. The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth: a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand. -Deuteronomy 28:49

This prophecy also speaks about a nation that speaks another tongue. 'Far from' means not from among your nation but from other' which denotes to the progeny of Ishamel. (from among your brethren Deuteronomy 18:18).

C. ...and this is the refreshing: yet they would not hear -Isaiah 28:12

And this is the refreshing - meaning revivalism or reminder

Jesus was sent to Israelites for their reformation. It becomes necessary only when the religion is found contaminated with invented traditions. But they mistook him to be a man not of God and hence they rejected him. Thus not accepting the reformations Jews remained in their former polluted religion. The Jews who believed in Jesus and accepted the reformations were identified by Jews as Nazarenes meaning the Jews who believed in and followed according to the teachings of Jesus that came from nazareth. But later they were supplanted by the group of Paul, who became victorious and established the christianity with all agianst to the teachings of Jesus. Thus again corruption became prevalent on the reformed Jewdaism¹. Thus both former Jews (Israelites) and latter Jews (christians) (both the houses of Israel (Isaiah 8:14)¹ were in need of revivalism. This is

1. Please refer our another book 'The Profile of Paul'

what God prophesied through the prophet Isaiah saying that He would send them a refreshing-

...and this is the refreshing -Isaiah 28:12

meaning revivalism of the religion.

In this regard, we have a corresponding prophecy of Jesus which reads as here under.

...he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you -John 14:26

From the above prophecy of Jesus we can find him saying as 'and (he shall) bring all things to your remembrance. This act becomes necessary only when his teachings would have been completely forgotten and new doctrines preponderated its place.

The above statement of Jesus can be taken to read as-

1. He shall teach you all things whatsoever I have said unto you.
2. He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you (John 14:26)

The first point can be taken to mean that he would not teach you new things but teach only that which I have taught you; since you would have forgotten them.

And the second point- He shall bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you means- He shall rule out all wrong dogmas what all prevail in my name and thus he brings the original teachings to your remembrance. Thus his teachings can be taken as revivalism and reminder of his original teachings. This applies to both houses of the Jewdism (Isaiah 8:14)¹

1. *And he shall be a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to both the houses of Israel, for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.*

*D. But the word of the Lord was unto them precept upon precept,
line upon line- Here a little there a little... -Isaiah 28:13*

Precept upon precept -line upon line- this part of the passage (prophecy) speaks about its revelation in piecemeal. That means the law was to come in piecemeal as according to the necessity of the occasion and demand of the time. And the verses were to be revealed repeatedly mutually supporting each other. Qur'an virtually agrees this fact in the following verses.

1. *And the Qur'an we have revealed in pieces that thou mayest read it to mankind at intervals, and we have sent it down piecemeal. -Qur'an 17:106*
2. *God has revealed (from time to time) the most beautiful message in the form of a Book, consistent with itself (yet) repeating (its teaching in various aspects); The skins of those who fear their Lord tremble thereat, then their skins and their hearts do soften to the celebration of God's praises. Such is the guidance of God: He guides therewith whom He pleases but such as God leaves to stray, can have none to guide. -Qur'an 39:23*
3. *Surely we have revealed unto thee the Qur'an piecemeal. -Qur'an 76:23*

E. ...here a little and there a little -Isaiah 28:13

Prophet Mohammad contributed his last 23 years in the prophetic service. The first 13 years at Mecca, his native place and the later 10 at Madina, after his migration (Hijrah). Hence some portion of the revelations were given at Mecca and some other at Medina respectively. This is what meant by 'here a little and there a little'. Thus all the four terms of the prophecy Isaiah 28:9-13 have been fulfilled in the person Mohammad- the universal prophet.

A UNIVERSAL PROPHET WAS PROMISED TO ABRAHAM

A universal prophet was promised through first son Ishmael by Hagar's progeny fulfilled in prophet Mohammad the prophet of Arab.

Let us have a glance over the promises as made pertaining to the universal prophet:

- A. *And I will make of thee a great nation... And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. -Genesis 12:2-3*
- B. *...seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and mighty nation, and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him. -Genesis 18:17-18*
- C. *And he said, lay not thine hand upon the lad... seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me... saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, that in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven and as the sand which is upon the sea-shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. -Genesis 22:12-18*

The clauses such as (1) 'in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed' (2) 'and all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in him' as quoted in the above references under (A) and (B) speak the advent of the universal prophet from the seed of Abraham. And again in the reference (C) above, it is made clear that the universal prophet was promised through the seed of Ishmael, the first son of Abraham 'And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed'. And God further provides the reason thereof saying as- 'because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son'. This incident refers to the event of Abraham's offering of his only son in

sacrifice to God. The phrase 'Thy only son' speaks that this event took place while Ishmael was the only son of Abraham, even before the birth of Isaac the younger son. These points we have discussed in detail in our earlier pages. Ishmael was the only son of Abraham until the birth of Isaac which took place after (14) years after his birth. At no time was Isaac the only son of Abraham which point is most essential to be remembered. These points make clear that the universal prophet was to come from the progeny of Ishmael. This goes to mean that prior to him all prophets were sent to the communities which they belonged to. In Israelites, in the progeny of Isaac the last prophet was Jesus.

Jesus was for Israelites only

A. *And when he (Herod) had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where christ should be born. And they said unto him, in Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judea; art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a governor [Jesus] that shall rule my people Israel.* -Matthew 2:4-6

The underlined clause of the above reference makes it clear that Jesus was a prophet, only to the people of Israel. This point is confirmed by Jesus himself in the following passages.

Jesus commands his disciples not to preach others except israelites:

B. *These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into any city of the samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.* -Matthew 10:5-6

C. Jesus makes it clear that he was sent as a prophet, only to Israelites:

But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. -Matthew 15:24

From the following passages one can understand Jesus also to have prophesied about the advent of that universal prophet. 'Jesus prophesied implies to mean the advent of that universal prophet would take place only after Jesus.

A. *And I will pray the father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever.* -John 14:16

B. *But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.* -John 14:26

C. *Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.* -John 16:13

From the foregoing prophecy of Jesus under point (C) it can be noticed that Jesus to have reminded the prophecy as made to Moses under reference Deuteronomy 18:18

Jesus reminds the prophecy made to Moses

For he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak and he will shew you things to come. -John 16:13

Original prophecy made by God to Moses

...and will put my words in his mouth: and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. -Deuteronomy 18:18

Comparison:

On a close comparison of the two, one cannot miss to find- though not both are verbatim in words - yet similar in meaning in every respect.

Church claims the fulfilment of this prophecy (deuteronomy 18:18) in the person of Jesus; while Jesus himself reminds it and promises that it would take place after him under reference John 16:13

And what more humourous is- the fulfillment of Jesus prophecy (John 16:13) is attributed to the person of Holy Spirit who had ever been present on all the prophets. We have discussed these points in our another book 'That Prophet'.

Apart from the foregoing, a clue has been provided by Jesus himself in his parable of vineyard showing that when would the advent of the universal prophet take place.

Hear another parable: There was a certain bouseholder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country (33): And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might recieve the fruits of it (34). And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another(35). Again, he sent other servants more than the first; and they did unto them likewise(36). But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, they will reverence my son (37). But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance (38). And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard and slew him (39). When the Lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen (40). They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons(41). Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone

which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes? (42) Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof(43). And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder (44). -Matthew 21:33-44

During my arguments with pastors, when the above parable is placed before them to explain my view point, they simply neglected to see what contains even, saying it is a parable. And they know if they take into consideration the parable, the matter becomes crystal clear. So they say- 'it is a parable'. parable means 'a story used to illustrate moral or spiritual truth'. It is no more than a camouflage plea. Opportunism of the pastors can be seen at the time of proclaiming 'he spoke every thing in parables', when the things are needed to be utilized in their favour.

All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them. -Matthew 13:34

Let us come to the point!

From the above parable of vineyard it can be explained as-

certain House Holder- God Almighty. vineyard- world; Husbandmen - mankind. servants - prophets.

But last of all he sent unto them his son- (means) as a last of the Israelite prophets God sent Jesus. And they caught him and cast him out of the vineyard and slew him- (means) They did not receive him but rejected.

He came unto his own, and his own received him not. -John 1:11

This further implies to mean that Jesus was sent as a prophet

only to the Israelite community but not as a universal prophet.

(After his death or departure)

What will happen? (Jesus enquires). The answer is given in the following verse 41 of the passage (by the audience)

They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wickedmen, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen which shall render him the fruits in their seasons (means)

The spiritual inheritance would be taken from Israelites and would be given to other people that bring forth the fruits in their seasons.

This goes to prove that until after Jesus what all God had expected from the people, the progeny of Isaac, the israelites, was not favourably and properly discharged. Jesus was the last prophet that appeared in the Israelite nation. After his death not physical but spiritual, meaning that no sooner did his teachings disappear than the spiritual inheritance would be transferred to another people who would render Him the fruits in their seasons. What the church (christianity) mistakes of this situation is that the spiritual inheritance which had been taken from the Israelites would be given to them (christians). They think that they are the rightly deserving people to inherit as they are, according to their illusion, rendering the fruits to God in the correct manner. The most sensitive point here is that this transfer of spiritual inheritance would be made only after the death of Jesus to mean spiritually that only after his teachings are completely supplanted by wrong doctrines. Thus the skeleton of christianity under the trade mark of Jesus prevails with no flesh and soul of his real teachings. If this be the fact where is the question of rendering fruits to God and to rejoice that they have inherited the spiritual kingdom of God? It is mere delusion. (to understand this subject our another

book 'The profile of Paul' may be referred). In this regard Jesus says, in support of our point that his teachings would be reminded by his successor. Thus we read:

But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you.
-John 14:26

This is a sure testimony that his real teachings would have been supplanted where the necessity of its reminder becomes inevitable. This underlines on two points.

1. His teachings would no more remain intact in practice.
2. He that brings them into their remembrance would come only after him (Jesus). Let us have a glance over the corresponding statement in the scriptures as said by Jesus.

Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation stone... -Isaiah 28:16

As said in the above prophecy Zion is the place where that cornerstone had been laid. Church believes that cornerstone is Jesus himself. But according to him, he (cornerstone) was to come after him. Moreover it was to come out of Zion. While Jesus was from Bethlehem (Jerusalem) which is the *captive daughte of Zion* (Isaiah 52:1-2)

(And Jesus says in confirmation of the above and expounds as here under from the scripture)

Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scripture, the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes? (42) Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the

fruits thereof (43) And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder. (44)

Synopsis of the parable

In the above parable Jesus explains that God created the world and man was made His vicegerent in it with dominion over it (Genesis 1:26). And for the guidance of mankind He appointed prophets as teachers and gave law through them. But except a few, all people rejected the prophets. This was the common experience in all nations.

Now he speaks particularly about the community of Israel: where many prophets had been sent prior to him and at the last he (Jesus) was sent. This emphasises on the point, as we say, that Jesus was the last of the prophets sent to Israelite nation. Him also they rejected. Now he enquires the people around him that what God would do after his departure. And in reply they said that the spiritual inheritance would be taken away from Israelites and it would be given to the other people that bring forth the fruits in their seasons. And in confirmation of this, Jesus explains in the consecutive verses 42-44. And from his reply what noticeable point is Jesus says-

The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of corner: This is the Lord's doing.

Builders - leaders of the Jews (Israelites). Stone that was rejected - Ishmael by Hagar, the second wife of Abraham,... (is become) head of the corner- progenitor of the universal prophet.

Thus Jesus revealed the fact that the universal prophet as promised to Abraham, was to come from the progeny of Ishmael.

This is to mean that Jesus had reminded them the prophecy of

David in palms 118:22-23 as an annotation to his vineyard prophecy.

The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing: It is marvellous in our eyes. -Psalms 118:22-23

What curious to know is that church attributes this prophecy also to Jesus. But in the parable of vineyard Jesus himself illustrates as an explanation that the rejected stone would become corner stone (advent takes place) only after his departure. Then therefore attributing this prophecy to the person of Jesus in no way can be justified and accepted.

We have another prophecy by Isaiah regarding this stone under the following passage.

*Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in **Zion** for a foundation stone a tried stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste. -Isaiah 28:16*

The church attributes this prophecy also to the person of Jesus. This prophecy also speaks of the universal prophet who was to appear from the progeny of Ishmael the first son of Abraham by Hagar. It is said of him (a) *foundation stone* (b) *a tried stone* (c) *precious cornerstone*. Who was it that corner stone? Who was it that after having been tried became precious corner stone? It was Ishmael the first son of Abraham by Hagar. How was he tried? While he was an infant below a year of age he was banished along with his mother Hagar to the wilderness of Beer-sheba. And again when he was a child about 12 years of age he was, on the command of God, taken to be sacrificed. But God well pleased with the sacrifice and declared-

'...because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing I will bless thee and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven,

and as the sand which is upon the seashore and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ; because thou hast obeyed my voice. -Genesis 22:16-18

Foundation stone means progenitor of the universal prophet. Thus Ishmael the then only son of Abraham was tried- and regarded as a sure foundation stone and a precious corner stone through whose progeny the universal prophet was to come... (*...In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed.*)

finally I would like to pin point on the fact that this prophecy can in no way be applicable to Jesus as he was from Bethlehem while the foundation stone was laid in **zion**

And the angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing; and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: That in blessing, I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the seashore: and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed : because thou hast obeyed my voice. -Genesis 22:15-18

The above verses have been discussed in detail in our previous pages. However, we once again would like to remind you that this is spoken in reference to the event of Abraham's offering of his only son in sacrifice to God. This speaks about the promise made to raise the universal prophet from the seed of Abraham (ie) the then only son Ishmael. This is what Jesus intended to expound on, that how the kingdom of God would be withheld from Israelites and would be given to Ishmaelites in the parable of vineyard.

'...and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies'- on this clause of the prophecy, Jesus gives his exposition as below, in continuation to his vineyard parable.

*And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.
-Matthew 21:44*

God revealed to Balaam the prophecy by the spirit of God

God brought him forth out of Egypt: he hath as it were the strength of an unicorn; he shall eat up the nations his enemies and shall break their bones, and pierce them through with his arrows. He couched he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion; who shall stir him up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee and cursed is he that curseth thee. -Numbers 24:8-9

Another prophecy: supports our arguments

When once master of the house is risen up and hath shut the door, and ye begin to stand without, and knock at the door, saying, Lord Lord, open unto us: and he shall answer and say unto you, I know you not whence ye are: (25) Then shall ye begin to say, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence; and thou hast taught in our streets (26). But he shall say, I tell you, I know you not whence ye are; depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity(27). There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth when ye shall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out(28). And they shall come from the east, and from the west and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God(29). -Luke 13:25-29

From the foregoing passage (under verse 25) it can be noticed that after the judgment the people who would have been condemned to Hell would seek the intercession of Jesus. But he would reject by saying 'I know you not whence ye are'.

The second verse (26) speaks that those who would have been condemned and would seek the intercession of Jesus, would also

be rejected with the same remark *'I know you not whence ye are'*.

These two groups of people may be taken as two houses of the Israelites. The first group- Jews, who did not accept Jesus (*...thou hast taught in our streets*) and the second group- the Jews, who accepted Jesus (which latter became christians) but did not follow the teachings of Jesus and worked contrary to his teachings (*...we have eaten and drunk in thy presence.*)

verse (27) says that their appeals cannot be heard, nor their case be condoned. In the verse (28) Jesus clearly explains that mere taking birth in the progeny of Abraham- or Isaac or Jacob does not entitle one the eligibility to acquire the kingdom of God, but by means of following as has been ordained by God through them.

we have a good reference to this effect in the following passage.

And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire
-matthew 3:9-10

What the striking point from the above is- so will be the fate of those who regard themselves as the followers of Jesus but work contrary to his teachings; which point is made clear in the following passage

Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? (22)

And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity(23). Therefore whosoever heareth those sayings, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a

wise man, which built his house upon a rock: (24) And the rain descended and the floods came: and the winds blew and beat upon that house: and it fell not: for it is founded upon a rock(25). And every one that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand(26). And the rain descended, and the flood came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house and it fell: and great was the fall of it (27). -Matthew 7:21-27

Verse 29 is the key verse of the passage Luke 13:25-29 under discussion. We learnt from our arguments that the universal prophet had not appeared until the time of Jesus who was the last prophet of Israelites. Then therefore the promised universal prophet was to appear only after Jesus which point also made clear in the parable of vineyard. In this verse, the significant point is that those that accupy the kingdom of God come from the four corners of the land which is a symbolic identity of the universal prophet. The successful entry of his followers into the kingdom of God is figuratively described in the parable of vineyard saying as- 'and will let out his vineyard unto the other husbandmen which shall render him the fruits in their seasons' and 'Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. (Matthew 21:33-44)

This may be taken as the exposition of Jesus on the promise of God made to Abraham about the advent of the universal prophet significantly saying as

...I have blessed him [Ishmael] and will make him FRUITFUL and multiply him exceedingly ... Genesis 17:20

Paul speaks of two prophecies corresponding to two women respectively. (1) Barren woman (2) Desolated woman. We generally find somany barren woman and desolated ones. It is a common thing with many of the women which phenomena take place as a

result of their natural or social ill-fate. So we have to know to whom do the above epithets aptly applicable to. We have also to know in whose case these prophecies represent to, which have been termed as barren woman and desolated one respectively. Now let us examine what Paul says in this connection.

Rejoice thou barren that bearest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.

-Galatians 4:2

What important thing that should be remembered here is- this is not a prophecy made by Paul but a reminder, of the prophecies what we have in the scriptures. In the above reminder we have apparently three women (1) Barren (2) desolated one (3) And she which has a husband. Here glad tidings are given to barren saying that the desolated woman hath many more children than the one that hath husband. Desolated one and one that hath husband makes out to mean that these two women were two wives of one husband (Abraham) respectively. Of them one was detained with him (and hath a husband) and the other was desolated (desolated woman). Now the question comes that who was the Barren. The barren woman was symbolic description of the one that was detained with husband and hence they correspond to one and the same woman Sarah. If one wife was desolated the other remains at home and keeps the company of her husband. And it was Hagar that was desolated (Genesis 21:1-21). Desolated hath many more children than she which hath husband (Barren) 'this speaks that Barren woman was also blessed with children.

He maketh the barren woman to keep house, and to be a joyful mother of children. praise ye the Lord. -Psalms 113:9

Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear: break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the married wife saith the Lord. -Isaiah 54:1

-

Isaiah 54:1

Barren woman that keeps house - Sarah.

Desolated woman that hath many more children - Hagar.

Jesus says while bringing into the remembrance of the audience (explaining the vineyard parable) the prophecy as stated in the scriptures...

Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures- The stone which the builders rejected the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes? -Matthew 21:42

The 'stone which the builders rejected' and the 'desolated woman' can be taken to mean as one person- that is Hagar, the mother of Ishmael. 'Barren woman that keeps house' and 'the married wife' can be taken to mean as Sarah the mother of Isaac. Thus two progenies came into being one by Isaac` Israelites and the other by Ishmael` Ishmaelites (Arabs). These points can be noticed in the exposition of Paul regarding these two posterities under Ref. Galatians 4:21-30

Jesus clearly admitted that the rejected stone (desolated-rejected one) becomes the corner stone. We have discussed and proved that Hagar was the rejected stone. This is to mean as saying that the prophet that would come from the progeny of Ishmael, the first son of Abraham by Hagar becomes the corner stone. Thus the Arabs become spiritual inheritors as promised to Abraham, and the universal prophet was to come from Arab. Now let us have a glance over the promises as made about the two sons` the progenitors of two progenies, Israelites and Ishmaelites respectively.

Before we discuss we would like to bring to your notice that Abraham was blessed and promised material favours as well as spiritual privileges of which the main was the promise of the advent of the universal prophet from his seed. Three different promises were made on three different occasions.

Promise about Ishmael

A. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great: and thou shalt be a blessing: And I bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. -Genesis 12:2-3

B. For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed for ever. And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, then shall thy seed also be numbered. -Genesis 13:15-16

C. After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abraham in a vision, saying fear not Abraham: I am thy shield and thy exceeding great reward. And Abraham said, Lord God what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless and the steward of my house is the Eliezer of Damascus? And Abraham said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir. And, behold, the word of the Lord came unto him saying, This shall not be thine heir: but he that shall come forth of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven and tell the stars if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, so shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness. -Genesis 15:1-6

A promise about Isaac

Let us see the promise made about Isaac through Abraham.

And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her, and she shall be a

mother of nations: kings of people shall be of her. Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear? And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee. And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed: and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him. And as for Ishmael, I heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him and will make him fruitful and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and will make him a great nation. But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year. -Genesis 17:15-21

Recollection of some important points

1. The first three prophecies as mentioned under references (A) Genesis 12:2-3 (B) Genesis 13:15-16 and (C) Genesis 15:1-6 were made to Abraham even before he was conferred with a child. The statement of God saying 'This shall not be thine heir, but he that come forth out of thine own loins shall be thine heir' (Genesis 15:1-6) evidently proves that the above three assurances were made to Abraham even before he was blessed with a child.
2. Abraham was having two wives- one Sarah the first one and the second, Hagar.
3. The second wife Hagar was blessed with a child by name Ishmael as promised to Abraham at his 86 years age.
4. When Ishmael attained 13 years of age Abraham was promised a second son Isaac by first wife Sarah. (Genesis 16:16)
5. When Abraham was 100 years old Sarah gave birth to Isaac. (Genesis 17:17)

6. Thus age difference between Ishmael and Isaac was 14 years.
7. This goes to prove that Ishmael was the only son of Abraham for fourteen long years until Isaac was given birth. As soon as Isaac was born, Ishmael was no more the only son. Let us bear in mind that when God was well pleased with the attempt of sacrifice to God- God forbade to carry on the sacrifice and blessed saying- *'for because thou hast done this thing and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son...'* This logic leads to conclude that it was Ishmael who was taken for sacrifice even before the birth of Isaac the second son. This further rules out the claim of church that it was Isaac whom Abraham took for sacrifice.
8. At no time was Isaac, the only son of Abraham as he was given birth when Ishmael the first son was fourteen years old, and both the sons buried their father who died at the age of 175 years (Genesis 25:7-9). This goes to prove that there was no chance to regard Isaac as the only son of Abraham. But as there was no birth of Isaac until Ishmael attained fourteen years, it can be accepted that Ishmael was the only son of Abraham for about fourteen long years.
9. From the promise under reference (c) above Genesis 15:1-6 it can be noticed that Abraham believed God. This is to mean as saying that Abraham believed that he would really be blessed with a child from his own loins: and he that who comes out of his own loins would be the heir of the promise for the advent of a universal prophet (Genesis 15:6)
10. Further we have another proof that Abraham believed that Hagar his second wife would give him the son and accordingly he was given the son Ishmael by Hagar. This fact can be disclosed by the promise of God made about the birth of Isaac. Until then he had no least idea that Sarah would conceive and bring forth a son.

- Had the promises made in the beginning been made relating to Isaac, no further promise under reference of Genesis 17:15-16 was necessary. Pastors say to this point that it is not a new promise, but old one only which has been renewed. They should read it with an open mind but not with open eyes (Genesis 17:15-16).
11. We have another reason to say that Abraham never believed that Sarah would bring forth a child through her bowels. At the time of receiving the promise, Abraham fell on his face and said unto God 'O that Ishmael might live before thee! This is to mean as saying "why another son Isaac, let Ishmael live before thee" (Genesis 17:17-18). Does this point not emphatically prove that Abraham had not at all expected the birth of a second son? and that he had believed the first son Ishmael only as his heir from whose posterity the advent of the universal prophet would take place?
 12. Under the promise (c) above under reference Genesis 15:1-6 it is assured to Abraham his heir would be one that "cometh forth out of thine own bowels". And Ishmael was the child that had been conceived by means of natural phenomenon of parents' natural sexual cohabitation and Isaac was born by means of miracle. Thus Ishmael's birth was natural and Isaac's was miraculous (Galatian 4:23). So Ishmael was the heir of the promise for the advent of a universal prophet.

In religious aspect majority cannot be determined basing on world census records but by the number of real followers

Here what one should note is that the desolated woman Hagar would have more children (Ishmaelites) than the children of the woman that keepeth husband (Israelites).

Now let us see how can they be more in number. As a matter of fact the children of barren (chiristians + Israelites -Acts 26:7) are more than the children of desolated (Ishmaelites=Muslims) according to the world census records. So according to the present statistics, the prophecy seems to be incorrect. The word of God- a prophecy made through the prophets, cannot under any circumstances go wrong. Then what the mystery is should be made clear.

In this regard we have a good reference in the following passage-

And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.
-matthew 3:9-10

From the above passage we can understand that one who is born in any community, cannot be the real member of that community unless one keeps the rudiments of the community in strict observance. God wants not the descendants but takes the number of people that really follow its founder. Contrary to the fundamentals he children of barren, that keepeth husband (Israelites) followed in their invented traditions neglecting the law of God.

1....Because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord their God and worshipped the other gods and served them
-Jeremiah 22:9

2. ...they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant... -Isaiah 24:3-6

keeping in view of the above points it can be well concluded that the spiritual privilege of Israelites had been gradually declined. Thus though they are more in number according to world records,

they became less in divine records. The spiritual inheritance has been transferred to Ishmaelites, the children of desolated woman. Thus though they are less according to world census, they are more in number than Israelites in the divine records.

Now let us examine another prophecy

When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt. -Hosea 11:1

This passage appears as God saying that He loved him [Israel] and called His son [Jesus] out of Egypt. But this interpretation is not correct. He called His son (The universal prophet) out of Egypt even when Israel was a child. This is to mean as saying that He would raise up the promised universal prophet from the progeny of Ishmael whose genealogy goes to Egyptian family. In the literal sense one may mistake the prophecy that God loved Israel. But the passages under reference (1) Jeremiah 18:12 (2) 16:11-12 and (3) 23:16-18 prove that Israel kindled the indignation of God by all his unlawful acts, so much so God declared that-

But my people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. -Psalms 81:11

Therefore it can be taken to mean as that whom God loved was not Israel but his son whom He called out of Egypt. Now the question comes that who was it whom He called from Egypt. Gospel writer Matthew mentions in his gospel under reference 2:15 that this prophecy has been fulfilled in the person of infant Jesus who was taken to Egypt for fear of infanticide by the king Herod, for a temporary period (2 or 3 months) and brought back to Jerusalem. As regards to this we have discussed in our previous pages and proved that the prophecy can in no way be applicable to Jesus, but it became evident that the universal prophet who was to come from the progenitors of Egyptian family - Ishmael had not come uptill the

time of Jesus and was to come only after Jesus as proclaimed by Jesus himself in the vineyard parable. Here he reminds the scripture as here under-

*Therefor I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof
-Matthew 21:43*

Let us remember here the promise made in regard to the progeny of Ishmael 'and I will make him fruitful (Genesis 17:20) 'which is corresponding to the proclamation of Jesus' the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof' This point unequivocally establish the fact that Jesus was not the person promised as the universal prophet but the promised universal prophet was to come only after Jesus.

Universal prophet did not come until the period of John and Jesus

Universal prophet means a prophet who was appointed for all nations. Till the advent of this prophet all other prophets were sent as regional prophets for their respective communities.

And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed: because thou hast obeyed my voice. -Genesis 22:18

The above verse speaks of the promise made to Abraham. This promise was made by God as a reward and special blessing to Abraham as he obeyed His voice. This discloses the fact that he had obeyed every order of God and came out all successful from all the trials of God in carrying out His command however adverse it might have been towards his person, with explicit faith and love on God. The reward that he was going to be blessed with is explained as- "in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed". Thus Abraham was to become the father of all nations.

And in thy seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed...

This goes to mean as saying 'a Universal prophet will manifest from the progeny of your son (seed).'

Abraham had two sons Ishmael and Isaac.

for it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by bondmaid, the other by free woman. -Galatians 4:22

Thus it is proved that Abraham had two sons out of whom two progenies flourished (viz.) 1. Ishmaelites 2. Israelites through the progeny of Ishmael and Isaac respectively. As many prophets as appeared from the progeny of Isaac all were sent to Israelite community only but there appeared no prophet in the status of the universal prophet even until the time of John and Jesus who were also awaiting for the advent of the Universal prophet.

John and Jesus were in expectation of the advent of the Universal prophet

Now let us have a glance over the following passages which disclose this fact.

A. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire. -Matthew 3:11

The above prophecy has been discussed most elaborately in our another book under title : '**That Prophet**'. The above prophecy speaks of a prophet to come after the prophesying person. Most evidently this prophecy seems to have been spoken about in reference to the universal prophet. As a matter of fact '**That Prophet**' and '**The Universal Prophet**' refers to one person that was to come as a guide to the entire mankind. If we accept the prophesying person as John and the person about whom it was prophesied as Jesus,

John could have in no way further enquired Jesus as follows:

Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ he sent two of his disciples and said unto him. "Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?" -Matthew 11:2-3

The enquiry of John to Jesus 'Art thou he that should come or do we look for another?'- is an authentic proof that the promised universal prophet had not appeared upto the time of John and Jesus. As John enquired whether he should look for another, he himself could in no way be the universal prophet. Now there remains one person, Jesus the last link of chain of prophets sent to the community of Israel, from the lineage of Isaac.

Was Jesus a Universal Prophet?

Let us see what he says in this regard-

From the following points one can very easily perceive that Jesus was in no way can be the universal prophet. But he was only a prophet who was sent to Israelites (Jews) as a last prophet among them¹ as a reformer.

Reformative work only meant for the people who have strayed from the right path.

And Jesus answering said unto them, they that are whole need not a physician: but they that are sick. I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. -Luke 5:31-32

At the time of sending his disciples to preach in other places he strictly ordered them not to preach among non-Israelites. Thus he did because he was not the universal prophet but one sent for Israelite community.

1. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying they will reverence my son.
-Matthew 21:37

These twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded them saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles and into the city of Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. -Matthew 10:5-6

He stresses on the point of not going to any other people except that of Israel and the reason thereof as follows:

But he [Jesus] answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. -Matthew 15:24

This discloses that Jesus was not at all the universal prophet. He also made clear on the point of his being a reformer.

*When Jesus heard it, he saith unto them they that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.
-Mark 2:17*

Thus from his own sayings as recorded in the above passages it became evident that he was a reformer sent for the community of Israelites only. Then therefore in no way can he be the universal prophet who was to come as promised to Abraham. But the church maintains that he (Jesus) was the universal prophet and to counteract the above clear passages as recorded above, it forwards the following passages in their defence.

A. *Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Ghost.
-Matthew 28:19*

B. *And he said unto them, Go ye into the all world and preach the Gospel to every creature. -Mark 16:15*

C. *And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.
-Luke 24:47*

At the first glance the above A,B,C references appear Jesus to have ordered his disciples to preach all nations of the world and to every creature. In this regard what important to note is the word 'every creature' refers to every Jew and 'all nations of the world' refers to all nations of the world where in Jews scatted and settled. As regards to this let us observe what Jesus has told in the following.

And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring and they shall hear my voice: and there shall be one fold and one shepherd. -John 10:16

"And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold"-means "I have other Jews which are not of this fold, which means Jews who scattered in other nations of the world". But church takes its meaning for gentiles¹. It is not correct. This mystery can be unveiled by the following passage.

For we have found this man a pestilent fellow and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes. -Acts 24:5

Who were the proclaimers and on whom the proclamation was made is a matter of no importance in the present context, but what was proclaimed is that he was the mover of sedition (disorder) among all the Jews throughout the world. This point discloses that the Jews were scattered all over the world to whom it is that Jesus had ordered his disciples to preach.

Thus it is made clear that whom Jesus had to preach of the other nations were not gentiles as church speculates but 'all Jews who were scattered all over the world' as we say. This point further rules out the claim of church and pinpoint on the fact that Jesus was not a universal prophet but a reformer of the Israelite community only.

1. gentiles means all people other than Israelites.

But he [Jesus] answered and said. I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel -Matthew 15:24

What more does the church need than the above authentic and clear saying of Jesus which dampens all its efforts to establish the point of Jesus' being a universal prophet? Then therefore this further elucidates on the point that the promised universal prophet was to come only after Jesus himself. So Jesus by himself cannot be the universal prophet.

Let us examine another prophecy

Principle elements of the religion were given to all nations by their respective prophet

For as the earth bringeth forth her bud and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth: So Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all the nations. -Isaiah 61:11

The above prophecy is deeply involved in figure of speech.

A. *for as the earth bringeth forth her bud...*

B. *and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth*

'Bud' of the clause under (A) and 'spring forth' of the clause under (B)... are two significant words which are symbolic description of the 'plant' and 'ground' respectively which bring forth its fruits. This speaks the fact that the seeds which were useful to reap the fruits, what was intended for, have been already sown. This metaphoric description stands to symbolise for the rudiments of the religion which had been given to all nations of the world. This also disclose the hidden fact that they were not ripe-enough to reap to the extant as had been desired of. Here one should not mistake the words that the religion was not ripe enough to reap in its literel sense but the

people were not responding to the religious rudiments in its perspective way as had been expected of God.

The religion given by the universal prophet is not a new religion but a reminder of the religion given to every people

A. Just as the earth bringeth forth her bud...

B. and as the garden causeth the things that are sown in it to spring forth...

C. [so] the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before 'all nations'.

This is the figurative description of the universal prophet (all nations) through whom the religion given to all prophets to all nations will come under one canopy and the rudiments of the religion will be reminded. Here one should not mistake that a new religion would be given through that universal prophet. But the religion what had been given to each nation would be reformed and the same religion would be reminded. Thus what would be given by the universal prophet was not a new religion but of their own in the form of reformation.

Qur'an confirms this point:

*A. This is a warner¹ from among the class of warners² of old.
-Qur'an 53:56*

B. say, 'I am³ no new messenger, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you in this life. I do but follow what is revealed to me; and I am but a plain warner. -Qur'an 46:9

C. Nay! surely it⁴ is a Reminder- so let him, who desires, pay heed to it... -Qur'an 80:11-12

D. It is nothing but a Reminder for all peoples. -Qur'an 38:87

The above verses imply to mean that prophet Mohammed was not a new messenger and his teachings were also not new ones but only a reminder of the earlier teachings and at the same time it is explained that his book Qur'an was/is a reminder to all nations (a reminder for all peoples 38:87). In the same manner the following verses disclose the fact that what Religion he preached is not a new Religion but continuation of the former Religion that was given to other prophets.

He has prescribed for you the Religion which he enjoined on Noah and which we have revealed to thee, and which we enjoined on Abraham and Moses and Jesus, saying 'remain steadfast in obedience and be not divided therein. Hard upon the polytheists is that to which thou callest them. God chooses for Himself whom He pleases and guides to Himself him who turns to Him. -Qur'an 42:13

Nothing is said to thee but what was said to the messengers before thee. Thy Lord is indeed the Master of forgiveness and also the Master of painful chastisement. -Qur'an 41:43

A prophecy of Jesus about universal prophet

In this regard the words of Jesus which he expounded to his disciples while promising of the comforter who was to come after him are noteworthy:

But the comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you. Peace I leave with you my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled neither let it be afraid. -John 14:26-27

From the above passage it can be noticed that there was another comforter to come after Jesus, who would teach his community all things and bring all things to their remembrance. This goes to mean that they would forget, what all was taught by Jesus and he

that was to come remind them. This is to mean, the Religion which comforter would preach is no other than what Jesus had taught them which fact can be well understood by the consecutive verse... "peace I leave with you, my peace give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled neither let it be afraid."

From the above warning of Jesus it can be well presumed that his real teachings would have been supplanted by all dreadful doctrines which are quite contrary to the teachings of Jesus. When the comforter reminds them the real teachings of Jesus, they naturally appear paradoxical and hence the people generally become hesitant to accept them. This was the reason that why Jesus told them- "let not your heart be troubled neither let it be afraid." How this nasty dialectic situation had become prevalent is comprehensively discussed in our another book 'The profile of Paul' which may be referred.

C. So the Lord God will cause righteousness and praise to spring forth before all nations.

This is the last clause of the prophecy under discussion. God explains that just as ground brings forth the bud and the garden springs forth the fruits, so also the universal prophet brings forth righteousness and praise before all the nations. Jesus also prophesies about the universal prophet saying him as comforter figuratively who was to come after him that how he establishes the righteousness saying as follows. so it can be taken to mean as Jesus to have confirmed the above prophecy of Isaiah about the advent of the universal prophet who was to come after him.

And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness and of judgment: -John 16:8

The church cannot attribute this prophecy to Jesus: as these are the words prophesied by Jesus himself. So it tries to impute this prophecy to the Holy Spirit.

Here what one should note is that prophets cannot do anything or speak of their own will. God sends the message to the prophets through Holy Spirit. What they hear from him that only they speak to the people. Thus Holy Spirit is a mediator between God and prophet. This fact can be noticed from the statement of Isaiah himself.

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me: because the Lord hath anointed me [chosen me to act as his prophet] to preach good tidings unto the meek: he hath sent me to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound. -Isaiah 61:1

So it became evident that there must be a prophet chosen of God on whom there descends the Holy Spirit and teaches the message what he brings from God: and accordingly the prophet acts and discharges his duty as has been conveyed through Holy Spirit. So a prophet cannot do any thing without the association of the Holy Spirit nor Holy Spirit can by himself do any thing without the company of the prophet. And this is how both of them unitedly perform the enjoined duty by God.

But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word which I have not commanded him to speak or that shall speak in the name of other gods even that prophet shall die. -deuteronomy 18:20

We can see a similar warning in Qur'an too.

And if he (Mohammad) had forged a false saying concerning us; we surely would have seized him by his right hand. And then we certainly would have cut off his life artery (aorta). And none of you could have with held us from him. -Qur'an 69:44-47

Jesus again prophesied as follows:

A. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. -John 16:8

B. Howbeit when he the spirit of truth is come he will guide into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. -John 16:13

The first of the above two passages under point (A) Jesus reiterates that there would come the universal prophet who would reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment. And the second point under (B) explains the method of the revelation as how a prophet conveys the message to people. Here, The Holy Spirit hears from God and speaks to the prophet. The prophet hears from the Holy Spirit and conveys the message to the people what he hears from the Holy Spirit. Thus Holy Spirit is a mediator between God and prophet, and the prophet is a mediator between Holy Spirit and the people. Hence it is said of the prophet as "*Howbeit when he the spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak; and he will shew you things to come*". Thus it is made clear that a prophet would teach to the people what he hears from the Holy Spirit but Holy Spirit by himself would not speak to people so as to ascribe the prophecy to Holy Spirit.

In another way it can be said that this is the reminder of the prophecy as made to Moses in Deuteronomy which reads as follows.

*I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth: and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.
-Deuteronomy 18:18*

The above prophecy has been discussed in our previous pages 164-233. Yet let us discuss it in another way.

Church ascribes the prophecy made by God through Moses about the advent of a prophet like himself - to Jesus.

The prophecy as made to Moses (Deuteronomy 18:18) has once again been reminded in the Book of Acts, as here under.

- a. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: (20)*
- b. Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the word began (21)*
- c. for Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. (22)*
- d. And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people (23)*
- e. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after as many as have spoken have likewise foretold of these days (24)*
- f. And ye are the children of the prophets and of the Covenant which God made with our fathers saying unto Abraham. And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. (25)
-Acts 3:20:25*

a. And he shall send Jesus Christ "which is recorded to have been told by God" whether a fact or fiction is not the point to be discussed but the consecutive verse under (b) which reads as- "*whom [Jesus] the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began*" - is providing some necessary information about the advent of the universal prophet and hence it became essential to be discussed.

In the above verse the key words *'The times of restitution of all things'* the meaning of which should be known.

The word 'Restitution' means (1) to restore or pay back the stolen or lost things to its owner when they are recovered. (2) to compensate in the form of money for the injury or damage caused. So according to context the first meaning is aptly applicable. 'Restitution' is figuratively used to remind what all people had forgotten the principle elements of their religion. As regards to this God told through all the holy prophets since the world began. This goes to mean that the people of all nations would forget the real teachings of their respective prophets. Thus it further focusses on the point that the universal prophet would remind the people of all nations. This period is described as the "times of Restitution" in the verse under discussion. Thus the points (a) & (b) (verses 20,21) of the passage make to suggest that Jesus should be in heavens till this times of Restitution. This goes to mean that the times of restitution would take place only after the departure of Jesus. Jesus also reiterates on this point saying as - *"But the comforter which is the Holy Ghost whom the father will send in my name he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you"* (John 14:26). What is the significance of the times of Restitution? It is explained in the point (c) under verse 22 of the passage.

c. For Moses truly said unto the fathers a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren like unto me: him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.

And point (d) under verse 23 of the passage says-

d. And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.

This verse shows the importance on believing on that prophet. if one does not believe that prophet he shall be destroyed from among

the people is a clear indication that the promised prophet (Deuteronomy 18:18) has been appointed for all nations in the capacity of the universal prophet. Taking this point in to consideration it cannot be applicable to Jesus as he was sent only for the lost sheep of Israelites (Matthew 15:24). That too the prophet for all nations would come only after the departure of Jesus.

Whose progeny does he come from?

point (f) under verse 25 of the passage provides its answer.

f. Ye are the children of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with our fathers saying unto Abraham- and in thy seed shall all kindred of the earth be blessed.

This point has been discussed in many of our pages and proved that the universal prophet promised to be sent through the seed of Abraham (ie) the first son Ishmael by Hgar. The whole argument is being revolved only on this point through out our book.

Prophet Mohammad for all nations and for entire world:

It is nothing but a Remindr for all peoples -Qur'an 38:87

*Nay, it is naught but a source of honour for all the worlds.
-Qur'an 68:52*

Let us discuss point (a) under verse 20 of the passage-

And he shall send Jesus Christ which before was preached unto you.

The foregoing verse appears to have been inserted (displaced) in middle of the passage under discussion. This passage is a reminder as we know of the promise and prophecy made to Moses to raise them up a prophet like unto Moses (Deuteronomy 18:18). The church interpret and attribute this reminder of the prophecy as well as origi-

nal prophecy to the person of Jesus. Even if we take the meaning of the words 'times of refreshing' (as mentioned in its former verses to mean as pleasant and advantageous days and accept the prophecy in favour of Jesus- the second coming of Jesus on the doomsday or resurrection day (John 5:28-30) which period will be so horrible as one fears to think of it even. So these refresting and restitution days cannot be taken for granted to be ones as spoken relating to Jesus.

Now let us examine another prophecy:

The advent of universal prophet was to take place in the last days

And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow into it.

And many people shall go and say come ye and let us go upto the mountain of the Lord to the house of the God of Jacob: and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths: for out of zion shall go forth the law and the word of the lord from Jerusalem. -Isaiah 2:2-3

N.B: We can see the same prophecy to have been quoted in verbatim with little difference in fear words in Micah 4:1-2

A. And it shall come to pass in the last days...

The above clause explains that the advent of the universal prophet would take place in the last days. 'The last days' do not refer to the days in which the doomsday will take effect but speaks of the days of the universal prophet after whom there comes no prophet nor prophecy. So these days are in the figure of speech described as last days. However this symbolizes for the last prophet after whom no prophet comes. This evidently speaks of the universal prophet. The sum and substance of these points is, the universal prophet would be

the last prophet. The last prophet means there should be no prophet after him. The church attributes this epithet to Jesus. Here we must know that Jesus was the last prophet for Israelites but not for all nations. But here the argument is going on about the advent of the universal prophet who was appointed for all nations of the world. Let us examine what Jesus says in this regard.

Jesus prays for the advent of universal prophet

1. And I will pray the Father and he shall give you another comforter that he may abide with you for ever

a. Another comforter means another prophet

b. that he may abide with you for ever- This means as saying that he is the last prophet after him no prophet comes- Thus 'he shall abide with you for ever'.

2. And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment.

The word- 'world' in the clause of the above verse is not spoken in the sense of 'people' as is used in many other places but here it conveys to mean as 'all nations of the world'

The mountain of the Lord's house was to be exalted above all mountains and all nations should flow into it

B. The mountain of the Lord's House shall be in the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills and all nations shall flow into it.

We can notice a symbolic description of the Lord's house. We will discuss about the House of the Lord in coming pages. It is certain that this house cannot be the temple of Jerusalem as it has been differentiated by the following clauses...

a. as made mention in the last clause of the second verse saying as '...all nations shall flow into it'.

b. And in the last clause of the third verse saying as 'for out of zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

As according to the point above (a)- 'all nations shall flow into it' very clearly speaks of the universal prophet which point further makes clear that it is not spoken about the advent of Jesus as church presumes since Jesus was sent only for the community of Israelites¹ while the prophecy about one who is appointed for all nations- hence it refers to the universal prophet.

As according to the point (b) above- 'Zion' is not the place where the ministry of Jesus had been carried out but stands for the place where from the advent of a law giving prophet would take place. Jesus was not a law giving prophet². But the prophecy speaks about a law giving prophet and the place where from his advent would take place saying as- 'for out of Zion shall go forth the law which is differentiated by clearly saying as 'the word of the Lord from Jerusalem'. Here the word means- 'the promise'. About whom the promise was made? This point is explained through Isaiah in the seventh chapter.

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son... -Isaiah 7:14

Thus a law giving prophet would come out of Zion and the promise (word) of God would come from Jerusalem. Therefore by no means this prophecy can be attributed to Jesus.

Another prophecy

Mohammad is a prophet like Moses

And he said, it is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. I will also give thee for a light to the gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth. -Isaiah 49:6

1. Matthew 15:24 2. Matthew 5:17

The above prophecy also speaks about the advent of the universal prophet.

Now let us have an analytic study of the each verse: or its relative clauses or its relevant information.

paraphrase of the above prophecy:

And he said = and God said

It is a light thing = it is very easy thing (for you)

Thou should be my servant = (for you) to be my prophet.

What was it that is described as easy thing? (it is a light thing) The answer is given as saying "To raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel."

To raise up the tribes of Jacob means to reform all the tribes of Israel- to bring them to their former original rudiments of their religion.

Preserved of Israel = Those who were intact in their original religion (uncorrupted).

This is to mean as saying those that were intact uncorrupted from the 12 tribes of Israelites. - They will also be restored means the universal prophet make them also follow the law given by him. (Galatians 4:24-25)¹

I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles = Though the universal prophet from one branch of Abraham he would be entrusted the duty of the universal prophet.

¹ For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid [Hagar] the other by a freewoman [Sarah]... For these are the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar. For this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia... -Galatians 4:22-25

I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles = This is to mean as saying I will make you a light (guide) to the Gentiles also.

Gentiles means all nations (mankind) other than Israelites. Thus the universal prophet would come from the brethren of Israelites (Deutornomy 18:18) (ie) Ishmaelites; the seed of Abraham.

That thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth- This is the affirmation of the points what we have mentioned about the universal prophet.

Jesus was not a universal prophet but a prophet sent to the lost sheep of Israel².

Jesus also affirms. Howbeit when he, the spirit of truth is come he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself: but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. -John 16:13

To speak in other way it is the exposition of the prophecy of Deuteronomy 18:18 which reads as follows.

I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee [Moses] and I will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.

Qur'an confirms:

- A. *Verily we have sent to you a Messenger, who is a witness over you, even as we sent a messenger to Pharaoh. -Qur'an 73:15*
- B. *Would you question the messenger sent to you, as Moses was questioned before this? And whoever takes disbelief in exchange for belief has undoubtedly gone astray from the righth path. -Qur'an 2:108*

The above Qur'anic references imply to mean as saying that Mohammad was a prophet like Moses. In these verses the simile is "Just as a prophet was sent to pharaoh so also a prophet (Mohammad) has been sent to you" As it was Moses who was sent to Pharaoh- it infers that Mohammad is a prophet like Moses as said in Deuteronomy 18:18.

Another prophecy

Bravery of the universal prophet and the confirmation of Jesus

- A. *And he will lift up an ensign to the nations from far and will hiss unto them from the end of the earth: and behold they shall come with speed swiftly: (26)*
- B. *None shall be weary nor stumble among them: none shall slumber nor sleep; neither shall the girdle of their loins be loosed nor the latchet of their shoes be broken: (27)*
- C. *whose arrows are sharp and all their bows bent, their horses' hoofs shall be counted like flint and their wheels like a whirlwind: (28)*
- D. *Their roaring shall be like a lion, they shall roar like young lions: yea, they shall roar and lay hold of the prey and shall carry it away safe and none shall deliver it (29)*
- E. *And in that day they shall roar against them like the roaring of the sea: and if one look unto the land behold darkness and sorrow and the light is darkened in the heavens there of. (30) -Isaiah 5:26-30*

The first verse of the above prophecy also speaks about the advent of a universal prophet (*lift up an ensign to nations from far*)... This information was given to Israelites and a hint was provided to them that he would come from far- means not from among them but from their brethren, as prophesied in Deuteronomy 18:18. Israelite's

². [Jesus said]... I am sent but unto the lost sheep of Israel. -Matthew 15:24

brethren are Ishmaelites (Galatians 4:22). This goes to mean as saying that the universal prophet was to come from the progeny of Ishmael (the son born to Abraham by Hagar). This prophecy cannot be attributed to Jesus as he was the Israelite from the lineage of Isaac.

Further the subsequent verses speak the bravery of the followers of the universal prophet. As regards to this let us have a glance on the statement of Jesus which reads as follows.

Jesus saith unto them. Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner; this is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes?

Therefore say I unto you the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder¹.

-Matthew 21:42-44

Who was the stone which the builders rejected..?

As regards to the rejected stone we have a good information in the letter of Paul to Galatians under Ref. 4:30-31

Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son [Thus it is made clear that the rejected stone was Ishmael born to Hagar by Abraham] for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. So then brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free. [Thus Ishmael was the rejected stone]

Where does he come from? He comes from Arabia. We have an information as follows:

for this Hagar [mother of Ishmael] is mount Sinai in Arabia.
-Galatians 4:25

1. Qur'an 48:29 and 100:1-5

What would be the privilege of the rejected stone?

The same is become the head of the corner [the universal prophet]. This is the Lord's doing... -Matthew 21:42

Thus in clear terms Jesus affirmed that the universal prophet would come from the progeny of Ishmael who would become the head of the corner. He comes from Arabia, as it is the nation where Ishmaelites predominated.

Isaiah had prophesied in another place as follows:

All ye inhabitants of the world and dwellers on the earth see ye, when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains: and when : and when he bloweth a trumpet hear ye. -Isaiah 18:3

It is said about the one who would give his message to all the world; while Jesus was sent for Israelites only.

Let us examine another prophecy which deals with the advent of a prophet for all nations:

Prophet Mohammad is salvation for all nations

The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. -Isaiah 52:10

This prophecy also speaks of the universal prophet by saying "and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God". 'Salvation' is a religious terminology connotes to mean- "to save a man from committing sin and from the consequences thereof". Thus the whole earth shall see the salvation means a universal prophet would be appointed as a saviour of the world. In this regard Jesus himself corroborates with our point of view by prophesying as -

A. And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment. -John 16:8

B. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of the teeth. -Matthew 8:11-12

C. There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when yeshall see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east and from the west and from the north, and from the south and shall sit down in the kingdom of God. -Luke 13:28-29

From the foregoing three prophecies of Jesus it is made clear that the universal prophet was to come after him. Further he stresses on the point that the followers of him would sit along with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and with all other prophets in the kingdom of God. They come from the four corners of the earth as he was the prophet appointed for all the nations. He clearly prophesied that those who do not follow him would be cast out into outer darkness. This can be taken as the interpretation of the following verse of the original prophecy which reads as follows:

And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name I will require of him. -Deuteronomy 18:19

And the same thing is corroborated in the Book of Acts under the following verse.

And it shall come to pass that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. -Acts 3:23

The more important point that can be taken from Jesus' above prophecy under Ref. Matthew 8:11-12 is that the people belonging to both the houses of Israel (ie) [many of] Israelites and Christians

would not believe that universal prophet but reject him, the requittal for this is that they would be rejected by God which point can be noticed from-

But the children of kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. -Matthew 8:12

In no way this prophecy can be applicable to Jesus as he was a prophet only to the community of Israel while the prophecy is about the universal prophet¹.

All ye inhabitants of the world, and dwellers on the earth see ye, when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when he bloweth a trumpet hear ye. -Isaiah 18:3

Zion: Now let us discuss about Zion

In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come and the children of Judah together, going and weeping they shall go and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces witherward saying, come, and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten. My people have been lost sheep: their shepherds have caused them to go astray, they have turned them away on the mountains: they have gone from mountain to hill, they have forgotten their resting place. -Jeremiah 50:4-6

The prophecy speaks about... In those days, and in that time which is to mean as saying- 'in the days and times after the advent of the universal prophet'.

Further God says in the prophecy that the children of Israel and the children of Judah- 'Shall come and go weeping'.

1. Isaiah 8:14

In the above clause of the prophecy two communities have been mentioned who would weep. Let us know about the two communities as mentioned in the prophecy before knowing the cause for their weeping.

One of the two communities is children of Israel means all Jews. And the another community is the children of Judah. Here differentiating children of Judah from the children of Israel appears to be incorrect. Because the twelve tribes of Israel includes the children of Judah also¹ so it is not 'children of Judah' but the another house of Israel (ie) christians. This point can be seen from another prophecy where the mention of saying as 'both the houses of Israel'(Isaiah 8:14). Thus the Jews from all the twelve tribes of Israelites who did not believe in Jesus remained as one house, and the Jews who believed in Jesus and who later became as christians are the second house of Israel. Therefore it may be noted that those 'come and go' weeping were not really the children of Israel and children of Judah but it exactly means to say as the children of Israel (Jews) and the children of Judah (christians). They come and go weeping- why? This is because the spiritual inheritance has been taken from them and the advent of the universal prophet took place from the Ishmaelites as promised to Abraham. These two houses of Israel were under strong belief that the universal prophet would rise from their own community (ie) from the progeny of Isaac.

Jesus clearly said this fact in the parable of vineyard:

He [God] shall come and destroy these husbandmen [Israelites] and shall give the vineyard to others. And when they heard it, they said, God forbid. And he [Jesus] beheld them, and said, what is this then that is written, the stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner?

-Luke 20:16-17

1. I Kings 18:31 II kings 17:34 Jeremiah 31:1

This is to mean as saying- the person and his birth place whom you rejected the same would become the head of the corner. This is to say in clear terms that his person and place where he lived would be given high priority in religious aspect as you would be proved unfit to be firm on religious rudiments as enjoined upon you.

And the another clause of the prophecy under discussion (Jeremiah 50:4-6) speaks that- "they shall go and seek Lord their God." This is to mean as saying that many of them believe on the God taking that the universal prophet was sent by him. Here a question may be raised that the prophecy says, "They shall seek the Lord God" which is to mean all the people belonging to the two houses of Israel, while our exposition says "many of them". For this our humble answer is that Jesus was sent for all the Israelites. Did all of them believe? no, some of them believed and some of them did not believe. This is the case with our present arguments too. 'They shall seek the way to Zion... come let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten'. The above part of the prophecy speaks of the place where from the advent of the Universal prophet takes place- the place known as the House of God (EL-Bethal). In those days and in that time, both the houses of Israel shall ask the way to zion, speaks explicitly that it was not figurative of Jerusalem as some explain but quite another as these two houses (Jews and christians) were well aware with Jerusalem as they had been regular worshippers in Jerusalem, as such there remains no meaning in searching for zion. More over Jews' had not built any temple for the worship for his followers as such. This point is further accepted by the clauses they shall ask the way to zion' and "they have forgotten their resting place". This point further proves that the zion was existent which they neglected out of envy. It is not the temple of Jerusalem but it is the House of God which was built by Abraham even before Jerusalem. In this regard we have a good reference in the gospel of John 4:20-23 which shows Jesus to have said...

The woman saith unto him, sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet. Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship. Jesus saith unto her woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the father. -John 4:20-22

The above dialogue of the Samaritan woman and Jesus clearly underline the fact that the place of worship changes from temple of Jerusalem to some other place known as Zion. The same point has been prophesied by the prophet Haggai.

And I will shake all nations and the desire of all nations shall come; and I will fill this house with glory saith the Lord of hosts.

The silver is mine and the gold is mine saith the Lord of hosts.

The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former, saith the Lord of hosts: and in this place I will give peace saith the Lord of hosts. -Haggai 2:7-9

What God prefers to call latter house in this prophecy by Haggai, was actually built by Abraham (ie) (EL-Bathal [zion]) and the former house is Jerusalem which was really built latter. So it is the latter house but not former as proclaimed in the prophecy. It is indeed paradoxical as it appears to be. The mystery can be disclosed if we ponder over the fact that God prefers to call it as latter, because it had lost its former glory as- 'They have forgotten their resting place' and it was filled with the idols. As now God was going to restore its glory back by the hands of the Universal Prophet, over the glory of latter house, God named this former house as the latter house. It is the will of God as the change of the status has begun by saying- 'silver is mine and the gold is mine' which stresses on the will of God where there is no chance of interference of any other in God's decrees. This logic leads to conclude that the former house is called latter and reversa.

Thus it is made clear in the prophecy of Haggai the latter house of God will be filled with glory of God which will be greater than the glory of former house. This will be done in the time of the Universal prophet as prophecy clearly says 'I will shake all nations' and 'the desire of all nations' which point makes it clear that it was prophesied about the Universal prophet's advent and the place of worship. We know that prophet Jesus was only for the Israelites nation but not for all nations.

...and come let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten.

This is another clause of the prophecy under discussion Jermeah 50:4-6. Let us discuss about this also.

"a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten" means the law which will be for all nations that lasts for ever and ever. For the clarification of the above point please take note of the following:

For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by bondmaid the other by a freewoman... for these are two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai. -Galatians 4:22-24

From the above the 'covenant' means the law. The one covenant (law) was given to Moses on mount Sinai. Mount Sinai is in Arabia...

For this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia. -Galatians 4:25

This speaks very clearly that Arabia is the place whereat Moses was given law and so also, the second law also was to come from Arabia. This is one more resemblance of that prophet who was promised to be sent, at the time of giving law to Moses on Mount Sinai in Arabia, 'a prophet like unto thee will I raise from your brethren - Deuteronomy 18:18'. This prophecy has been clearly discussed here and there in our previous arguments which all go to provide a com-

prehensive exposition on the prophecy.

It the second law was also given, it goes to mean, after that law-giving prophet no other prophet ever comes until the end of the world. Thus he is the Universal prophet who was to come from Hagar's lineage as promised to Abraham (Genesis 12:1-3).

In spite of clear prophecies why people were confounded and confused in recognizing the Universal prophet-God Himself provides the reason in the prophecy, Jermiah 50:4-6.

My people have been lost sheep: their shepherds have caused them to go astray they have turned them away on the mountains; they have gone from mountain to hill, they have forgotten their resting place.

Another prophecy- Isaiah 60:14-16

The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee the city of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy one of Israel. Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations. Thou shalt also suck the milk of the Gentiles and shall suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord an thy saviour and thy redeemer, the mighty one of Jacob. -Isaiah 60:14-16

In the above prophecy we have three verses.

Let us examine the first verse:

The sons also of them that afflicted shall come bending unto thee; and they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The city of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel.

The sons also of them that afflicted shall come bending unto thee:

Who were the sons that afflicted? They were the sons (progeny) of Ishmael the first son of Abraham who settled in Arab. They afflicted means they were real worshippers of the God of Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac in the beginning.

How had they afflicted?

They were keeping the house of God as pure as it was in the beginning without any polytheistic activities entertained therein but later on as the years passed by they gradually inclined towards polytheism and began to fill the House of God, with so many statues whom they were worshipping. Thus they afflicted the House of God.

And they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet:

Who were these that despised the House of God?

These were the sons (progeny) of Isaac the second son of Abraham, who latter called by name Israelites. They revered the House of God in the beginning but later on they despised. Having no love and affection towards it in the beginning the question of despising does not come at all. This is how please examine the following example:

Example: He divorced. The word divorce itself includes the act of taking one as a legal wife under matrimonial ceremonies. If there is no solemnizing of marriage the question of divorce does not come. So also they despised the House of God means in the beginning they were in good attachment of reverence as the House of God.

And they shall call thee the city of the Lord, The Zion of

the Holy one of Israel

When do they call it the city of the Lord the Zion of the Holy one? In the land of Arab the Arabs, the progeny of Ishmael was in majority as polytheists and the second place was accupied by both Israelites and christians. There was no question of Gentiles but with exception of very few.

The recognition as made above would come after the advent fo the universal prophet and after his victory over the Arab nation. All people of the Mecca accepted the universal prophet and began to follow his guidance. Then the people of Mecca who revolted against the universal prophet Mohammad, in the beginning when he came out victorious, they with their own hands removed all idols from Zion and cleansed it from polytheistic practices. This act is described by God saying as 'whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency a joy of many generations'. This goes to mean as saying that as it has been revoked by the hands of the universal prophet its excellency lasts eternally.

How the Arabs were defeated- the following prophetic pasage speaks in clear terms:

*The burden upon Arabia in the forest in Arabia shall ye lodge
O ye travelling companies of Dedanim.*

The inhabitants of the land of Tema brought water to him that was thirsty, they prevented with their bread him that fled. For they fled from the swords, from the drawn sword and from the bent bow, and from the grievousness of the war. For thus hath the Lord said unto me within a year according to the years of an hireling and all the glory of Kedar shall fail: And the residue of the number of Archers the mighty men of Kedar shall be diminished: for the Lord God of Israel hath spoken it.

- Isaiah 21:13-17

We have a corresponding affirmation by Jesus which reads as follows.

Jesus saith unto them, did ye never read in the scriptures, the stone which the builders rejected the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes? Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

-Matthew 21:42-44

Now let us examine the last verse of the prophecy under discussion- Isaiah 60:14-16

Thou shall also suck the milk of the Gentiles and shall suck the breast of kings: and thou shalt know that I the Lord am thy saviour and their redeemer the mighty one of Jacob.

This verse corresponds to the advent of the universal prophet. Until the advent of the universal prophet the glory of the God's House in Zion was confined to the house of Abraham (ie) both Ishmaelites and Israelites. But they frofamed its glory as explained by us in our former pages. After the advent of the universal prophet the glory of God's House became common to all people of the world. This is what the clauses- 'Thou shalt such the milk of the gentiles' and 'shall such the breast of kings' of Isaiah 60:16 and this is how the glory of latter house shall be greater than the former and this is the place where one can get peace as according to Haggai 2:9.

Zion is the place where God dwells

The Lord also shall roar out of Zion and utter his voice from Jerusalem: and the heavens and the earth shall shake but the Lord will be the hope of his people and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God dwelling in Zion my Holy mountain: Then Jerusalem be holy and there shall no strangess pass through her any more.

And it shall come to pass in that day that the mountains shall drop down new wine and the hills shall flow with milk and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord and shall water the valley of shittim -Joel 3:16-18

Let us take some important clauses from the above prophecy:

'The Lord also shall roar out of Zion' From these words 'roar out of Zion' may be taken as figurative to mean as 'out of Zion law shall come forth'.

Just as--

A. *For a law shall proceed from me -Isaiah 51:4*

B. *...from his right hand went a fiery law for them
-Deuteronomy 33:2*

C. *For out of Zion shall go forth the law... -Isaiah 2:3*

D. *For the law shall go forth out of Zion... -Micah 4:2*

E. *The place where God dwells [House of God] is Zion...
-Joel 3:17*

The House of God is the place known as Zion

A fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord:

Now let us see where from the fountain came.

And God heard the voice of the lad [Ishmael]; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven and said unto her what aileth thee Hagar? fear not: for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise lift up the lad and hold him in thine hand for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water; and she went and filled the bottle with water and gave the lad drink. And God was with the lad

and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. -Genesis 21:17-21

The above passage which provides prophetic message has been discussed in our previous pages. In the above passage a well of water was found by Hagar after her eyes were opened by God. Whereas a fountain of water was created by God for the lad and the mother. Our readers have found so many articulations of the church in throughout our arguments. Were it really a well of water, in the wilderness in the well water gathers at the deep of the bottom of well. To draw the water from there it would have been another problem for Hagar. Unless she could get 20 meters of rope and a bucket it could not have been possible for her to draw the water from the well. But as soon as she found it she filled the bottle with water. This goes to mean it was not a well of water but a fountain (spring) of water wherefrom the water has been gushing forth ever since to this day. That place is called Paran. From the passage under discussion can be noticed that the place wherefrom a fountain comes forth- is the House of Lord. Therefore Paran can be termed as the House of God.

God came from Teman and the Holy one from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light, he had horns coming out of his hand and there was the hiding of his power. Before him went the pestilence and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood and measured the earth: he beheld and drove asunder the nations and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow; his ways are everlasting. I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction: and the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble. -Habakkuk 3:3-7

The first verse of the passage speaks of two persons (viz) (1) God came from Teman and (2) The holy one from mount Paran. Thus the God and the Holy one- two persons are obvious. The first

clause of the first verse speaks about God who was to come from Teman (or South). However as this is a prophecy it should have been written only in future tense. Then therefore the second clause makes it clear that somebody who is called Holy one was to come from mount Paran. Now the question is that who was it that had to come from **mount paran**. The answer for this we can see from the following:

*And she went, sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bow shot, for she said, let me not see the death of the child, and she sat over against him and lift up her voice and wept. And God heard the voice of the lad; and the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven and said unto her what aileth thee Hagar? fear not: for God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Arise lift up the lad and hold him in thine hand: for I will make him a great nation. And God opened her eyes and she saw a well of water and she went and filled the bottle with water and gave the lad drink. And God was with the lad; and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness and became an archer. **And he dwelt in wilderness of Paran:** and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. -Genesis 21:16-21*

From the above passage it is learnt that Ishmael the first son of Abraham and his another Hagar were the only two persons who dwelt in Paran. They dwelt there under the mercy of God who miraculously provided fountain of water and sustenance. And it was a wilderness and so there was no inhabitation of man. But as the fountain began to flow water ceaselessly (till this day) the area became fertile and gradually people began to come and dwell there. Ishmael lived there not for a month or two but (probably) the whole term of life. The following verse disclose these facts.

And God was with the lad; and he grew and dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt. -Genesis 21:21

Thus the place became a city and acquired a spiritual signifi-

cance too the reasons thereof have not been clearly mentioned in the Bible. However the following verses speak about its spiritual prominence.

(It was called) ...El-Paran -Genesis 14:6

NB: El- is ancient word for God.

So Jacob came to Luz which is in the land of Canaan that is Beth-el he and all the people that were with him. And he built there an altar and called the place El- Bethel: because there appeared unto him... -Genesis 35:6-7

The above explanation proves that the Paran is to mean as saying 'Paran of God' and the altar built by him was called House of God, which point provides a great spiritual significance.

Here is another prophecy:

...they shall call thee, the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel -Isaiah 60:14

Thus the mount Paran wherefrom God shone and wherefrom the Holy one was to come was one and the same place which was called Zion. Therefore mount of Paran is figuratively called Zion. This point most reasonably agree that **Zion** is the **mount Paran**.

We have another point which proves that the mount of Lord is the place where the only son of Abraham had been offered in sacrifice (Genesis 22:14) we have argued profusely and proved that Ishmael was the only son of Abraham who was given in sacrifice. So the area where Ishmael lived was known as mount of Lord.

*...and he shined forth from **mount Paran**...
-Deuteronomy 33:2*

*...and the Holy One (came) from **mount Paran**...
-Habakkuk 3:3*

Thus the place where Ishmael dwelt accumulated great spiritual significance. -Genesis 21:21

And this Paran is a wilderness region of Sinaitic peninsula- which is the region of Arab. So this can be well- established that Paran is the place of Arab.

This point can be proved from the following

For this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia... -Galatians 4:25

Thus from the progenitors of (Ishmael S/o Abraham by Hagar) the Holy One, the universal prophet was to come from Arab, the Paran.

Now let us go back to the prophecy under discussion- Habakkuk 3:3-7. The third and fourth verses of the prophecy make mention of the high reputation and the privilege given to the Holy One what is described as here under.

His glory covered the heavens and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light: he had horns coming out of his head and there was the hiding of his power. (3,4)

The fourth verse is full of metaphoric description. The first clause says 'his brightness was as the light' which may be taken to mean as 'his way of preaching was as the guidance. Here we must know that the guidance can be obtained by means of law. So it can be interpreted that he gives the law and teachings which work as guidance. As regards to this we have a reference 'from his right hand went a fiery law for them' (Deuteronomy 33:2). And the second clause 'and there was the hiding of his power'. This goes to mean that he had his power hidden under leadership over his ferocious disciples- 'he came with ten thousands of saints' (Deuteronomy 33:2), which point is further attested by Jesus himself in the parable of Vineyard saying-

Therefore say I unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder. -Matthew 21:43-44

Before him went the pestilence and burning coals went forth at his feet: He stood and measured the earth: he beheld and drove asunder the nations and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow, his ways are everlasting. I saw the tents of Cushan in affliction: and the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble (5,6,7)

All these verses speak that how ferociously do the Holy one makes war on the nations to subjugate the people to hear the word of God as told by Jesus himself in the parable of vineyard.

And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder.

Further we have an affirmative statement as made by Jesus in the Gospel John. 16:8

And when he is come he will reprove the world of sin and of righteousness and of judgment

Another prophecy:

And there was given him dominion and glory and kingdom that all people nations and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. -Daniel 7:14

And there was given him dominion and glory and a kingdom that all people nations languages should serve him:

This means the prophet who was to come would have dominion and glory bestowed which speaks of his high privilege.

a kingdom that all people nations and languages should serve him' This symbolizes for his being the universal prophet.

His dominion is an evelasting dominion which shall not pass away and his kingdom that shall not be destroyed'. - This is to mean as saying that the law- dominion and kingdom what would be given to him endure till the end of the world as he was the Universal prophet and after him no prophet should come.

Jesus confirms the above fact:

And I will pray the father and he shall give you another comrtor that he may abide with you for ever. -John 14:16

The above prophetic passage explains that there was to come another prophet. After him no other prophet ever comes. This is true because it is represented by the word "another" which stands for singular person. And he was to come after Jesus only because Jesus himself prays for his advent (*I will pray the Father*). This rules out all claims of the church which are made in favour of Jesus in attributing the prophecies made relating to the Universal prophet.

From the above arguments it is made clear that this prophet would be for all men of all nations and languages But Jesus was for Hebrew speaking people (Israelites) only as a regional prophet. And moreover he was not given any kingdom while the Universal prophet had his own kingdom which will endure upto the end of the world. And hence this prophecy in no way can be applicable to Jesus. Kingdom here means- Theocracy where he acts as viceroy for the devine rule. In this the law given through scripture should be in rule. This was established by the prophet Mohammad the Universal prophet which endures till the end of the world; which Jesus asked his disciples to pray that the kingdom of God (Theocracy) might come, in

other words he and his disciples prayed for the advent of the Universal prophet. This point evidently proves that Jesus can in no way be the promised prophet. Prophet Mohammad the Universal prophet was compared with the prophet Moses (*...I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee* -Deuteronomy 18:18). Prophet Moses was given law and the theocracy was in rule in his times (Exodus 19:3-6) which continued till upto the last days of his successor Joshua (Joshua 1:18). Israel rejected Theocracy and preferred to be ruled by a king (I Samuel 8:4-9). Thus the kingdom of God (Theocracy) turned in the kingdoms of people.

But it had to be restored:

A. *And many people shall go and say, come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the House of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people.* -Isaiah 2:3-4

The prophecy made by Isaiah has been corroborated in verbatim by the prophet Micah.

B. *And many nations shall come and say, come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the House of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths; for the law shall go forth of Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among many people and rebuke strong nations afar off...* -Micah 4:2-3

C. *And whereas they commanded to leave the stump of the tree roots: thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee after that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule.* -Danial 4:26

NB:- Heavens do rule means theocracy would be prevalent

D. *Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed: when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion and in*

Jerusalem and before his ancients gloriously. -Isaiah 24:23

Comes out of Zion:

E. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. -Psalms 110:2

F. The Lord shall reign for ever, even thy God, O Zion, unto all generations: praise ye the Lord. -Psalms 146:10

G. Let Israel rejoice in him that made him: Let the children of Zion be joyful in their king. -Psalms 149:2

H. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the Government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called wonderful, conseller, The mighty God, the ever lasting Father the prince of peace. Of the increase of hsi Government and peace there hall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The Zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. -Isaiah 9:6-7

In the above we have quoted reference from the Bible which all go to establish our view point that Jesus was not the promised Universal prophet who was to come from Abrahams first son's posterity by Hagar (ie) Ishmael- the race of Ishmaelites.

The following points focuss more light on our points:

...for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. These are the last two clauses of the verse (3) of Isaiah (2) chapter.

From the first clause it is clear that the law giving promised prophet was to come from Zion. In our previous arguments it is made clear that this Zion is the symbolic name or Paran, Arab; which in no way can be imputed to Jerusalem as it has been differentiated by saying the word (promise) was to come as made out in Isaiah

7:14. Here two points must be noted. Jesus who was of Jerusalem did not give law but he was only an annotator of the then existent law, while the person that was to come from Zion was to give law.

The same prophecy has been quoted in verbatim in Micah 4:2-3 as mentioned in our point (B)

In our point (c) under Danial 4:26- '...that the heavens do rule' which is to interpret that the Theocracy would be re-established. Jesus prays that "Theocracy' to come. Therefore it evidently proves that the person under whose dominion the kingdom of God (Theocracy) becomes prevalent is not Jesus but one that comes from Zion (Arab).

And the point (D) admits that the Theocracy would be established in mount Zion- and the further words make clear that the Theocracy thus established by the Universal prophet who appears from Zion would take hold his dominance over Jerusalem and some other nations too (*the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion and in Jerusalem and before his ancestors gloriously*). This is the reason why in the Bible in so many places Jerusalem is said as 'captured city of Zion¹ 'and' daughter of Zion²

Now let us discuss point (H) under Reference Isaiah. 9:6-7

In this prophecy some specific epithets of the one who was to come have been described, such as...

1. For unto us a child is born unto us a son is given.

2. and the Government shall be upon his shoulders

3. and his name shall be called wonderful, counsellor,

1. Isaiah 52:2 2. Zechriah 9:9 and corroborated by Jesus under Matthew 21:5 and John 12:15

4. the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace.
5. of the increase of his Government and peace there shall be no end
6. upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth ever and ever.
7. The Zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform thus.

1. The first point speaks about the privilege given to the child. If there is/are no some abnormal characterestic nature/natures in the child, no need comes as to specifically saying as 'For unto us a child is born' and 'unto us a son is given'. Christian theologians hold the birth of Jesus from a virgin's womb as the highest privilege which is attributed to the point (4) above [and his name shall be called] the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace. Thus divinity is ascribed to the person of Jesus, son of the virgin.

Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. -Isaiah 7:14

How much more the church beats its breast shouting, Jesus is... the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace, the above prophecy of Isaiah basing on which they founded the incarnation theory of Jesus, dampens it as saying, the Lord himself give you a sign'. Thus Jesus was only a SIGN but not divine incarnation in human flesh. Another question is, whether the sign came of its own self or given by Lord? Prophecy makes it clear that it was given by Lord himself. Here what understood is, God did not come of himself as a sign, as is propclained by church but He sent the sign. What is the sign? A virgin conceives and brings forth a child. This spaks of high privilege... to whom? To the child who was conceived of or to the virgin who conceived? To whom does/ do the credit of exaltation

go? Whether to virgin mother or the child conceived of a virgin? Had the child himself manifested as a sign then the credit goes to him. But what pifiable is that he was sent. And had the virgin conceived of her own self the credit goes to the virgin mother. But in this phenomenon neither child nor the virgin had any part, depriving both from accredited privilege. Thus the sign stands as a markd of capability of God in doing whatever He likes to bring about where the child and virgin mother were only instrumental in bringing about the sign. This point is unequivocally admitted in the prophecy itself under our point (7) which clerly reads *'The Zeel of the Lord of hosts will perform this'* (Isaiah 9:7)

Let us examine another relevant point.

And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb and bring forth a son and shalt call his name Jesus -Luke 1:31

According to prophecy Isaiah 7:14 child's name is Immanuel. The meaning of Immanuel is according to the prophecy of Matthew 1:23 in his own words- 'and they shall call his name Emmanuel which being interpreted is, **God with us**.

We can see the difference in names with its interpretations in the above two prophecies. According to thefirst- the name is 'Immanuel' to mean 'God with us' and second 'Jesus' which is to mean 'saviour'. Thus the contradiction between the names with its meanings- of the two prophecies is vivid.

There is another relevant prophecy which speaks about the birth of he child.

For unto you is born this day in the city of David, a saviour which is christ the Lord. -Luke 2:11

unlike the former two propecies this prophecy presents a unique system of the birth of the child.

'For unto you is born this day in the city of David a saviour which is christ the Lord'.

In clear terms it is to mean as saying that christ who is Lord by himself and a saviour, is born this day in the city of David. Thus in this prophecy God himself is directly born from the womb of a virgin. In this way divinity is awarded to Jesus.

And again the following passage contradicts the above prophecy:

He shall be great and shall be called the son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever and of his kingdom there shall be no end. -Luke 1:32-33

Unlike the former prophecy, this prophecy speaks of him only as a son of the Highest. In the former prophecies we learnt that he was an incarnation of God. Thus the SIGN which was to be given to the people has no decisive epithet as to what he is- whether God, Incarnation or son of God.

But the original prophecy Isaiah 9:6-7 presents decisively the following epithets in the infant, who was going to be given.

"...and his name shall be called (1) wonderful (2) counsellor (3) the mighty God (4) the everlasting Father (5) prince of peace. Now let us examine the epithets as stated, one by one, whether they attract to the person of Jesus or to the person of promised Universal prophet.

1. WONDERFUL: The church tries to attribute this epithet to Jesus taking his miraculs us birth. No doubt that having been conceived of a virgin is really a wonderful thing. As regards to the privilege that should go to the person in events such as these, we have

explained in our pravius arguments basing on the fundamental points of the prophecy that the privilege goes neither to the mother virgin who concieved nor to the child conceived of from the womb of a virgin; but it purely expresses the capability of God in performing the things whatever he likes ot do. If at all church tries to establish divinity to Jesus mere basing on this point, Adam deserves higher right of claiming divinity as he was the person who came into existance without parents.

Whom does the title wonderful attract?

Jesus birth was a miraculous one- this is a greater privilege than any other.

He did a number of such miracles as none ever had did (John 12:37). Basing on these points, church has founded the Doctrine of Jesus' divinity. We can find Jesus to have spoken on one occasion *'All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth'* (Matthew 28:18). Inspite of all these supernatural advantages, he could not restore the kingdom of God on earth- and on the other hand he prayed and asked his disciples to pray that the kingdom of God might come. This is another point which deprives the claim of church that Jesus himself is the prophet like Moses under Reference Deuteronomy 18:18. Moses established the kingdom of God and as it had been vanished it was to be restored by the prophet like Moses. Jesus could not restore but prayed and asked his disciples to pray for it.

A. And he said unto them, when ye pray, say our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done as in heaven so in earth. -Luke 11:2

B. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. -Matthew 6:10

C. But seek ye first the kingdom of God... -Matthew 6:33

From the above three references it became clear that the kingdom of God was not prevalent in the days of Jesus and he prayed that it should come. This explicitly proves that Jesus was not the person who had established the kingdom of God which was to be restored.

The kingdom of God was to restore yet:

- A. *Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion and in Jerusalem and before his ancients gloriously. -Isaiah 24:23*
- B. *The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. -Psalms 110:2*
- C. *The Lord shall reign for ever, even thy God, O Zion unto all generations. praise ye the Lord. -Psalms 146:10*

From the above three references it can be known that the kingdom of God was to be restored... (*the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion*). And was to come with power (*the Lord shall send the rod of thy strength*). And it shall remain for ever and ever. (*The Lord shall reign for ever even thy, O Zion unto all generations*).

All the three references show that it was to come from Zion. In our former pages we came to know that Zion is a symbolic name for Arab. Therefore it clearly speaks that a universal prophet was to come from Arab who would establish the kingdom of God with all his might which 'shall be in rule for all generations' Moses was a prophet under whose supervision and care the kingdom of God was prevalent. After its decline it was not restored upto the time of Jesus and so it was to restore after Jesus, a sure testimony. After Jesus no prophet ever came who proclaimed that he was the prophet like Moses (ie) who should give law and restore the divine rule on the earth. I do not think that it is necessary to place before the readers all these axiomatic historical evidences. Thus prophet Mohammad

of Arab the descendent from the lineage of Ishmael became the head of the kingdom of God on earth. This goes to prove that all the characteristics as made mention in the prophecy of Isaiah 9:6-7 unequivocally applicable to prophet Mohammad.

For unto us a child is born unto us a son is given: and the Government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called wonderful, counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father the prince of peace.

Of the increase of his Government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even for ever. The Zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. -Isaiah 9:6-7

Prophet Mohammad was a posthumous son of Abdullah and while he was yet child of six years age his mother Bibi Amina died. Thus he became an orphan who could establish the kingdom of God on earth. Prophet Moses established the kingdom of God which was lost. And therefore it was to be restored. All these points we have learnt in our previous pages. As according to the prophecy made to Moses that God would raise a prophet like himself (Moses), there was a prophet to come after him... (from their brethren). In this prophecy the comparison between the two prophets- Moses and the one like unto him chiefly rests on two important features (viz). 1. Giving of law and 2. establishing of the kingdom of God. These two features should be accomplished by one that resembles prophet Moses (...like unto thee). We have learnt that Jesus was not the prophet who gave law nor could he establish the kingdom of God on earth but had been curiously praying God that His kingdom might come which point proves that the prophet like Moses would come only after Jesus. And accordingly prophet Mohammad could restore the kingdom of God. In spite of his being a helpless orphan, poor, and illiterate and with enemies all around he could convey the oneness of God among some of his people. Here I do not like to write the his-

torical events relating to his defensive wars etc. which took place during his lifetime. Those that are interested to know may refer to the history of 'The prophet Mohammad'. However, with his handful disciples he came out successful from his battles and established the kingdom of God which is the main reason to describe him- as WONDERFUL. And the government was on his shoulders- and thus he was a counsellor in all state affairs. And in the kingdom of God there prevails all peace and hence he was called 'The prince of peace'.

Now there remain two titles awarded to that prophet which also need to be discussed.

1. His name shall be called - 'The mighty God'
2. His name shall be called - 'The everlasting Father'

What is the kingdom of God stand for?

Jesus makes it clear-

Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven
-Matthew 6:10

And again Daniel makes it clear that the kingdom of God means... the heavens do rule (Daniel 4:26). Here heavens figuratively mean God. Thus God does rule. Kingdom of God is the exact meaning which can be substituted for God rules. Kingdom means an area of place which is under one's reign. Of God means the kingdom which is under the reign of God. Therefore the prophet who acts as a viceroy of the God, as he rules the kingdom of God, is figuratively said as-

1. His name shall be called 'The mighty God'
2. His name shall be called 'The everlasting Father'.

If it is only in the figurative sense but not in literal sense as God Himself makes clear that there is none like unto Him.

1. *How then can man be justified with God? or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? -Job 25:4*

NB: Here one must know that Jesus was also born of a woman.

2. *For who in the heaven can be compared unto the Lord? Who among the sons of the mighty can be likened unto the Lord? -Psalm 89:6*
3. *To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be alike? -Isaiah 46:5*
4. *To whom then will ye liken me or shall I be equal? saith the Holy one -Isaiah 40:25*

Now we have to examine the second half of the prophecy which reads as here under.

Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from hence forth even for ever. The Zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. -Isaiah 9:7

The Zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this...

This is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes? (Matthew 21:42 and Mark 12:11)

1. *Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end:* It does not mean that the government established by him spread all over the world; but it means to say that his government endure endlessly.
2. *Upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it and to*

establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth for ever. This is to mean as saying that his kingdom means Arab and upon the throne of David means Palastine. Thus he establishes his kingdom of God both on Arab and Palastin which lasts for ever and ever. It is a known fact that Jesus never ascended the throne of David (Palastin). But in 300 BC. when the Roman emperor became christian it can be treated as Jesus became the ruler of Palestin which lasted upto 600 BC; upto the rise of Isalm; which lasted upto 1947. Thus the christian rule lasted for 300 years only while the Muslim rule over Palastin 1350 years. But between 1947-50 the Muslim rule over Palastin went to christians again. Temporary lapse of Muslim rule for about 60 years (This is written in the year 2009 BC.) cannot over rule the word of God which said 'that it lasts for even for ever'. Rise and fall of kingdoms are not constant and permanent. But the word of God never fails. So it can be accepted that his government upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom to order it and to establish with judgment and with justice from henceforth for even for ever to have been fulfilled in the person of the universal prophet Mohammad.

Now let us examine the last point of the prophecy...

The Zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this...